The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

NEARLY thirty years ago the late Lord Balfour called attention to two opposing tendencies which were becoming discernible and which in the intervening years have become more marked. There were the impulses towards the closer association of States and organizations with common interests, especially in security, with war as the enemy of all in which victory was only less costly than defeat, so that the pressing necessity was to evolve a political and economic system which removed the fear of it from civilized life. And there was the impulse towards freedom and autonomy crystallized in President Wilson's phrase "the self-determination of peoples". The reconciliation of these two mighty opposites is the great political problem of our time. Neither can be forgotten.

On the one side there are the United Nations, which as yet seem to be too comprehensive to be effective, the Atlantic Pact and the movement towards Western Union, made possible by Marshall Aid; on the other, there are "the cold war" within the United Nations, India's demand for freedom even at the cost of partition, Ireland's decision to leave the British Commonwealth, the uncertain situation in South Africa, the establishment of the State of Israel in the very heart of Moslem territory and a dangerous confusion in Malaya.

* * *

As we write, however, there appears a rift in the storm clouds over Europe. The blockade of Berlin has been lifted and a meeting of the Foreign Secretaries of the Powers is being held. Russia gives way only when she must and is fighting a rearguard action as she retreats. The dangers are still great. A change of tactics does not necessarily mean a change of heart. The air-lift not only saved Berlin from starvation but has been an impressive demonstration of Western power and determination. The cold war has not yet been won, but equally it has not been lost, and there are indications that it is being more and more widely realized that co-operation is the condition of freedom.

* * *

THE exceptions in this cautiously hopeful reading of events are Israel, now, however, admitted to membership of the United

Nations and the Republic of Ireland, which has transferred its loyalty from the British Crown in order to hand over its newly-gained sovereignty to the Vatican. Mr. De Valera came to this country to demand the coercion of Ulster, and this being refused, armed guards patrol Downing Street to protect Mr. Attlee against Irish gunmen. There is juvenile delinquency even among nations!

* * *

Mr. Attlee is not an exciting public figure. But his patience, skill and integrity are increasingly impressive. His part in letting Ireland go and keeping India in the Commonwealth has enhanced the prestige of Britain in a way for which the future may be grateful.

* * *

In ecclesiastical affairs it is the tendencies toward union which hold the attention. The fissiparous tendencies need no emphasis. Amsterdam brought the Churches together (always remembering that the Roman Catholic Church and the Russian Orthodox Church were not there) in a way that will make co-operation easier even if organic union is still a far distant goal, and has already done much, and will do more, to stimulate that spirit of liberalism to which Dr. Brunner pays tribute in the address to the Congregational Union printed in this issue.

* * *

The final volume of the Amsterdam Reports is now published under the title "The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches" (S.C.M. Press, 12s. 6d.). It is an account of what was done and a summary of what was said, which we hope will be widely read. The fact that the Assembly was held is indeed remarkable, but it is important that what was said and done should be known and pondered by every intelligent Christian. It brings a sense of the great issues with which we are concerned, which will comfort and encourage those who work in isolated minority communities and challenge those whose Christian life and thought are still too narrowly parochial. Here is evident the conviction, shared by all Christians, that God has spoken and revealed in Jesus Christ His purpose of salvation for this fallen world and that the Church is the body of Christ, Who now has no other hands, no other feet, no other voice than ours. But, alas, we partake of the very nature of the world to which we are sent to minister as ambassadors of Christ. The Body of Christ is sick because we are what we are. But there is a Divine Physician. The Holy Spirit is real and asks only to be allowed to work unhindered. On us rests the responsibility of offering ourselves to be used. But we hesitate. We make conditions. We plead our history, which so often means our prejudices. We are not content with the Kingdom of God. We

want also the kingdoms of this world. "Not Thy will but mine be done." How long, oh Lord, how long?

* * *

FROM these international and ecumenical concerns we come to more limited but still important national discussions. There has been published "An Interim Report of Conversations between representatives of the Archbishop of Canterbury and representatives of the Evangelical Free Churches" (S.P.C.K., 4d.) in which it becomes clear that our divisions do not arise out of the fundamental articles of the Faith but almost entirely out of the various doctrines of the Church. These Conversations, under the joint chairmanship of the Bishop of Derby and Principal Micklem, began in 1947 and have proceeded on the basis of the sermon preached at Cambridge by the Archbishop in which he drew a distinction (we quote from the Report) . . . between his own suggestion and what he described as "constitutional" schemes of reunion, i.e. schemes which "posit between two or more denominations an agreed constitution by acceptance of which they become one". For various reasons he suggested a new way of approach applicable to this country. "My longing is, not yet that we should be *united* with other Churches in this country, but that we should grow to *full communion* with them. . . . Full communion between Churches means not that they are all identical in all ways, but that there is no barrier to exchange of their ministers and ministries. . . . I am presupposing that between the Churches . . . there would be found to be agreement upon the essential principles of the Church, the Scripture, the Creeds, the Sacraments, and of the Ministry itself as 'a gift of God through Christ to His Church, essential to its being and well-being, perpetually authorized and made effective through Christ and His Spirit' (Lausanne, Report 5)". He also referred to the necessity for safeguarding the place which the Episcopate, the Council of Presbyters, and the Congregation of the Faithful, respectively, should have in the good order of the Church.

* * *

THE Report continues . . . On the doctrines of God the Father, the Person and work of Christ, the Person and mission of the Holy Spirit, the Trinity, and the Life Everlasting we have found nothing which separates any one of these Communions from another. All acknowledge the apostolic faith as contained in the Scriptures and expressed in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. It has been noted that there is difference of practice in the use of doctrinal formularies, which must receive detailed consideration at a later stage.

On the doctrine of the Church the following statements were unanimously approved by the Conference as expressing the convictions of the Churches represented:

(a) The Church is not a voluntary association of individual believers; it rests not on the will of men, whether as individuals or societies, but on the creative will of God.

(b) The visible unity of the Church is the divine will for it. Visible unity does not imply uniformity, but implies at least that each part of the Church is able to recognize every other part as professing a true faith and administering the sacraments and discipline of Christ by means of its Ministry, in such a way that there are no barriers of principle to prevent co-operation in evangelization and free mutual participation in worship and sacraments.

(c) The Ministry being the gift of God to the Church, and existing in and for the Church, is integral to the continuation of the mission of Christ to the world.

(d) The Church is the body of Christ and the structure of the Church should express its function. Thus order is the vehicle of the Spirit.

(e) The unity and continuity of the faith should be preserved; that is, the order of the Church should be such as to symbolize, safeguard, and mediate the apostolic message and mission.

An essential element in continuity is the maintenance of the apostolic faith, worship, and witness as set out in the New Testament.

It is recognized that the intention of existing Ministries, both episcopal and non-episcopal, is to preserve the unity, continuity, and universality of the Church.

(f) It is recognized as desirable that pastoral oversight should be exercised within a group of congregations, parishes, or churches by those who in their official capacity represent the Church as a whole; and it is stated that in some form or other in all the Churches there is such oversight.

At the request of the Free Church delegates the following points were put forward by the Anglican members of the Conference as among those which in their judgment seemed to require investigation:

(a) What functions, other than that of ordination, would be regarded as so essential to the episcopate that they must be safeguarded by a Free Church "taking episcopacy into its system?" It might be held that in the last resort only the function of ordaining was really essential to the episcopate. No doubt *that* at least would be so regarded, but surely also some oversight of the Church's life, and a final voice in declarations on faith and order. If so, would this imply:

(i) bishops voting as a House in any Free Church Assembly,

so that presbyters and laity should have no overriding powers in matters of faith?

(ii) episcopal confirmation?

(iii) some measure of jurisdiction over local congregations?

(b) The admission of women to the presbyterate (especially if episcopally ordained), and the lay administration of Holy Communion, would from the Anglican point of view gravely complicate the questions both of interchange of Ministry and of intercommunion. Underlying this, in the judgment of many Anglicans, would be the theological question of the relation of the ministry of the Word and Sacraments to the life of the Body of Christ. In other words, might not more than simply episcopacy prove to be at issue?

(c) It would be a further question whether the Anglican Church would be prepared as a whole to admit Free Churchmen to communion without previous confirmation.

* * *

At the request of the Anglican delegates the following points were put forward by the representatives of the Free Churches as among those which in their judgment seemed to require investigation:

(a) The conception of the continuity of the Church. Is the most important element in this conception the episcopal succession, or, as the Free Churches have always held, the proclamation of the apostolic faith in word and by life, together with the administration of the gospel sacraments? They were encouraged to believe that this question was not incapable of solution because of the recent statement in the Lambeth Conference Report, where it is said (p. 63): "None of us hold that tactual succession and correct formulae of ordination can guarantee a true and effectual episcopate or presbyterate, apart from the faith and corporate life in which they are set."

(b) Is episcopacy a part of the gospel? If not, it is presumed that the same liberty of interpretation of "the historic episcopate" would be allowed as is at present allowed within the Anglican Communion.

(c) Is the Anglican interpretation of the functions of the episcopate reconcilable with the high place assigned to the laity in the Free Churches, in virtue of which laymen are empowered to preach, and also to take part in the decision of questions of faith and practice?

(Note. On the question of lay administration of the sacraments there are diversities of usage amongst the Free Churches, but where lay administration is permitted it is only by duly authorized persons. The existence of this practice is in large measure due to the desire to provide regular and frequent observance of the Lord's Supper.)

(d) Is it agreed that Anglicans could have intercommunion with Churches whose methods of admission to full membership were different from their own, such as the services of believers' baptism and "reception into full Church membership"? It is noted that in the Ceylon scheme believers' baptism and confirmation are to be parts of one service.

(e) Is it agreed that it is possible to establish full communion as defined in the Archbishop's sermon (p. 9) between the Church of England and the Free Churches in this country, and yet to leave each denomination to continue its identity?

* * *

THE Report concludes . . . The Conference is aware that in some quarters it is urged as an objection against this whole method of approach to reunion, as compared with constitutional schemes, that it provides no guarantee that there will be a real growing together, such as would make ultimate union a possibility. It is essential that there should be such a growing together, and a genuine sharing of different traditions, so that the impetus towards ultimate union may come not only from the leaders, but from the whole body of the Churches concerned. It is vitally important that the visible unity of the Church of Christ should be accepted as the final objective, and that this should be kept clearly in view at every stage, even though this final goal be as yet distant.

* * *

IT will be seen that the Report is carefully, even cautiously, worded with some uncertainty in its phraseology. We have no desire to intervene in the discussions which are proceeding but some clarification is needed of what is meant by saying that "the Ministry . . . is integral to the continuation of the mission of Christ to the world" (para. 5 (c)), and we note that the admission of women to the presbyterate (nothing is said of their admission to the episcopate), and the lay administration of Holy Communion would from the Anglican point of view gravely complicate the questions of the interchange of the Ministry and of intercommunion (para. 8 (b)).

* * *

THE Report will be read with interest in other parts of the world in view of the refusal of the Lambeth Conference to accept the suggestion from the Church in China to admit women to the ordained Ministry and its inability to arrive at a united and unqualified recognition and acceptance of the Ministry of the Church of South India. The Rev. T. S. Garrett of Tirunelevi Theological College, writing in *The South India Churchman* quotes the conditions on which full intercommunion would be accorded, laid down by a committee of theologians, appointed to advise him by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and promises to examine them in detail in subsequent issues to which we shall

look forward. On the general attitude of the committee—and of the Church so far as it has accepted its guidance—Mr. Garrett, however, says: "To many it may seem surprising and lacking in realism (coming, as it does, from an older church to a younger one, we will avoid categorizing it as impertinent) that a church, which tolerates so many uncertainties and compromises in its midst and is shackled, as far as its two mother provinces are concerned, in all its movements by its connection with the State, as well as by other long-established customs and privileges, should presume to lay down conditions of this kind. One cannot refrain from commenting on it as a signal example of failure to 'consider first the beam in thine own eye'; and there are indications in other parts of the Report that the Bishops have not been sufficiently radical in their self-criticism nor concerned enough about putting their own house in order before advising others how to order theirs. If reprisals were not wholly unchristian, we might retort that we had grave hesitation and anxiety about being in full communion with two provinces of the Anglican Church, which have in the past allowed their Bishops to be nominated by a Unitarian Prime-minister and acquiesced in a barbaric medieval law imposing dire penalties on Cathedral Chapters which refuse to elect Bishops thus appointed, and one of which has tolerated so heretical a Bishop as Dr. Barnes of Birmingham for over twenty years as a Diocesan. It is astonishing that some of the more traditionally "catholic" sections of the Anglican Church have not refused to allow their Bishops to go to Lambeth and suggested that the Anglican Episcopal conference should be held in a less Erastian environment than that of England.

However, the spirit in which the suggestions quoted above are intended is undoubtedly one of brotherly love and a sincere desire for the right kind of unity in the Church, as is indicated by the final words of encouragement in the Report of the Archbishop's Committee of Theologians and by the recent invitation to Bishop Jacob to take part in an Anglican consecration. There are signs, too, that many of those who thus passed judgment on us are aware that they and we alike stand under the divine judgment. Let us, therefore, humbly acknowledge this fact and examine their suggestions in a spirit of meekness to see whether their adoption by us would in fact (a) promote further union and (b) be in accord with principles which we in South India hold to be fundamental to our union".

* * *

Is it true, as Berdyaev suggests in his essay "Some Trends in Humanism" that "in modern society, Christianity has fallen so low and has become so feeble that it is identified with clericalism"?

We have been greatly refreshed in spirit by the perusal of *The Prospect for Christianity* by Dr. K. S. Latourette, Professor of Missions and Oriental History in Yale University (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 6s.), not only because it is a hopeful book—and how easy it is to forget that hope is not the least of the Christian virtues—but because Professor Latourette looks forward as well as backward, and stands, like Habbakuk, "in the midst of the years". It is a book that perhaps could only have been written in America in these days, but how good to be reminded that "what we call Christianity is the vehicle of the Gospel, but is not identical with it," and that forms of Christianity which have been handed down to us from the past are not for all time the normal and final expressions of the Gospel.

When so many theologians seem to be content to dot the i's and cross the t's of mediaeval philosophers, here is a historian insisting that we must not "bind the Gospel in the grave clothes of the past". "We may be able honestly to subscribe to the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds and be grateful for them, but we cannot think of them as well rounded, balanced descriptions of the Gospel". Here is a Christian scholar who not merely subscribes to a doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and discerns its operation in the past, but sees its activity in the present and trusts it for the future. In his account of "the current threats and challenge", Professor Latourette seems to us never to put a foot wrong, and in his final chapter "The opportunity of our generation" he summons us to evaluate our treasure in history and in the Bible, to recover the sense of the infinite resources of God in Christ, Whose work is not yet done and so to accept cheerfully the responsibility of the Great Commission of making disciples of all nations.

Three thousand miles away from the fearful preoccupations of Europe and free from the age-old prejudices which are so deep as often to be mistaken for convictions, Professor Latourette seems to breathe the morning air and share its freshness with us.

* * *

Nicholas Berdyaev in a book of twelve essays *Towards a New Epoch* (Geoffrey Bles; paper, 6s.), speaks out of the heart of the strife and offers us the last comments of a Russian philosopher, who began life as a Marxist Communist, became a Christian, spent the last years of his life as an exile in Paris, writes with no easy optimism but has many profound observations on things as they are and as he believed they will develop. We, who know little of Russia except what we fear from a ruthless revolutionary Government, may be glad of the insights of this book and its evidence of aspects of Russian life and thought which find so little oppor-

tunity of expression. Berdyaev had a deep appreciation of the catastrophe which has overtaken Europe, "the savage has re-appeared at the summit of civilization", and believed that liberalism had lost its power over the European mind. Nevertheless the sheet anchor of his faith is the freedom whose roots are in the spiritual nature of man created in the image of God. Rational principles which have lost their power are useless weapons against irrational principles, "which if not evil in themselves, engender evil". "Faith is the only weapon we can use, and faith is supra-rational". He believed Capitalism to be an inadequate foundation for the new humanism, which is the real Christianity, and that Communism may be regenerated by the recovery of spiritual freedom. (It is interesting to compare Dr. Brunner's condemnation of Communism with Berdyaev's belief that Communism may yet be freed from materialism and develop into a Christian humanism as the great contribution which Russia may yet make to the world.) Berdyaev died hoping, though there is yet little sign of it, that the spiritual heirs of Holy Russia have enough vitality to bring that mighty people into the real comity of a revived and renewed Christendom.

* * *

ANOTHER book not to be missed is *Authority and the Individual,* being the Reith Lectures for 1949, by Bertrand Russell, delivered over the radio and now published (George Allen & Unwin, 6s.). It is easily possible to be stimulated and instructed by the observations of one of the acutest minds of our time and yet be conscious of something missing. We who build the house of our faith upon the rock of revealed religion cannot be anything but sympathetic towards those whose goodwill is unquestioned but who are yet struggling to find a foundation on which to build hopefully and securely in this world, where the things that can be shaken have been shaken. Russell's theme is one that is with us always and always will be—the conflict between Authority and Freedom and their reconciliation, which is always necessary and is never final. In our own time Authority is extending with a speed that makes mistakes inevitable over an ever-widening area, which makes their consequences the more dangerous. Criticism is an important function of the philosopher, and we can only be grateful for the skill and sureness with which the need for the security of the welfare State is set over against the price that must be paid for it. It is interesting to find Russell so evidently agreeing with Lord Beveridge that private initiative is so valuable a factor in human affairs that it must be safeguarded and encouraged to the utmost limit of social security.

* * *

Our correspondent writes (27.4.49)—

It is to be hoped that Londoners have appreciated all the opportunities of seeing good pictures that have recently come their way. Some would no doubt deny that the Chantrey collection comes within that category, but the Galleries are gradually being opened, and at the moment there are masterpieces from Vienna and from Munich to be seen. Perhaps some people will be too surfeited to visit the Academy, and, truth to tell, they will find the Exhibition far from impressive.

This year the authorities staged a stiff test for their press critics —not only so much because the refreshments once so welcome in the middle of the morning have not yet reappeared, as that for the first two hours the catalogues had not arrived. To attempt to identify artists is an exercise that soon palls. The President's exhibits were, of course, easily recognizable—horses all the way, even the artist's wife is mounted; Dame Laura Knight's bright colours were characteristic ("The Plough" is a fine painting, but "North Country Hill" looks like nothing so much as the end of the world) and so were her husband's portraits: there was no mistaking Mr. Elwell's interiors (all his exhibits are worth study) or Mr. Lamorna Birch's landscapes. But who could be expected to identify Mr. Winston Churchill's six works, most of them painted over twenty years ago?

Mr. Denis Fildes's portrait of the King is pleasing, and Mr. Halliday has been very successful with the Duke of Edinburgh, more so indeed than with Princess Elizabeth. Gowns and robes no doubt make things easier for the artist; Mr. James Gunn's portrait of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr. Campbell Taylor's of the ex-Lord Mayor of London have seized the advantages thus offered. Clearly Mr. Fleetwood-Walker will have to watch his mannerisms, and it is sad to think we shall see no more of the late Francis Dodd, whose "Artist's Grandfather" is exceptionally good. Among others whose portraits are above the average are Mr. de Glehn, Sir Gerald Kelly and Mr. Henry Lamb.

There are some notable paintings of flowers (*e.g.* Mr. Watson's "Flowers in a White Jug") but flowers are beautiful in themselves; Mr. Bowden has shown how beauty can be conferred even on "Two Ashbins".

As usual, there is little about religion, and "A Salvation Army Prayer Meeting" cannot be esteemed anything but a failure. The new Bishop of Peterborough proves the reverse of a good subject, but colourful vestments help to make Mr. Brockhurst's glassy "Monsignor Sheen" and Mr. Elwes's "Cardinal Hinsley" attractive.

Sport fares about as badly as religion: we have Mr. T. A. Higson, Chairman of the Lancashire Cricket Club, looking for all the world as if he were watching his county meet their usual fate against Yorkshire, and no Cup Final referee ever had a task so hard as the referee in charge of "Goal-mouth"; five players are visible, and they wear four distinctive colours.

Here are some pictures readers should not miss: Mr. Henry Carr's "Striped Dress" (perhaps the most striking exhibit) and his "Griller String Quartet"; two pastels by Mr. A. K. Lawrence; Mr. Cundall's "Unveiling of the Roosevelt Memorial"; Mr. Markiewicz's "Last Touches"; Mr. Spencelayh's "Generation to Generation"; Mr. Connard's "Winter" and Signor Annigoni's 518, 519. Unfortunately they will not be able to miss Mr. Minton's huge "The Harbour". (P.S.—Here I am glad to find myself in agreement with Sir A. J. Munnings!)

It is interesting to see Kingsley Martin, J. B. Priestley, Jan Masaryk and Hannen Swaffer close together in the Sculpture Room, where Mr. Elkan's posthumous bust of Lord Keynes for King's College, Cambridge, is an amazingly good likeness.

An instructive hour can be spent in the Architectural Room. From the designs for Schools, Colleges, Civic Centres, and Power Stations, it looks as if, once building really gets started, we shall see a change in the face of England.

With this issue the Rev. Geoffrey F. Nuttall, M.A., D.D., ceases to be responsible for our Review section. His resignation, due to increasing pressure of work, has been generously postponed for the convenience of the present Editor, who is glad to record his great indebtedness to Dr. Nuttall, whose erudition and literary judgment have been invaluable to the *Quarterly* during the last four years and in particular during the past few months.

He is succeeded by the Rev. E. C. Blackman, M.A., B.D., of Cheshunt College, Cambridge.

THE CHURCH BETWEEN EAST AND WEST[1]

By Emil Brunner, D.D.

The question formulated in our topic obtrudes itself imperiously whether we like it or not. The East-West-problem not merely dominates the secular political discussion, but it has also become, at least since Amsterdam, a source of deep concern within the Church. It would be a sign of unreality if the Church refuses to face it, claiming that such political issues are outside her own concern, which is the Eternal Gospel. Yes, the Church has to proclaim the eternal gospel of the sovereign Lordship of Christ, of His victory over all the powers of darkness, accomplished by His death and His resurrection, the gospel of reconciliation and salvation for all who believe, the gospel of the kingdom of God which will be the end and consummation of all history. But the Church has also received a prophetic office, the task of calling to repentance, of teaching the Law to individuals and to societies and to States. And this office is particularly important in our day of spiritual and moral confusion, where evil is called good and good evil, where all standards of justice are being shaken and where the sense of what is human, the sense of the dignity of man, is darkened and almost effaced by inhuman ideologies. It would be a tragedy and unpardonable guilt if the Church should fail in her prophetic task of the day by misunderstanding her eternal priestly office. She *must* speak out about the greatest and most urgent political, social and cultural problem of our day, included in the words East and West. It must, however, be clear from the start that this formulation—the Church between East and West—is misleading. Whatever the solution for the Church may be, one thing is excluded beforehand, that the position of the Church could be one *between* East and West, such as the position of Israel was between Assur and Egypt. The Church as an ecumenical body is *in* East and West. We Europeans forget so easily that there is a Russian and an American church, that is, a Church which cannot be neutral in the conflict indicated by the two words East and West. Whatever might be said about the two, the Eastern and the Western powers, these two words indicate two situations in which Christians live and have to live, and in which they have a certain measure of responsibility for what happens or does not happen within the political field. We, as Christians in countries which are less immediately involved, have no right to

[1] An address delivered to the Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, May 1949.

detach ourselves from those other churches and their problems, quite apart from the fact that in the political sense nobody is really outside the conflict in a time like ours.

Let us first try to define more clearly what is meant by these two catch-words, East and West. In hearing them everybody, at least in Western Europe, thinks of the obvious rivalry between the two dominating world-powers, Soviet Russia with her satellites on one hand, and the United States of America and the members of the Atlantic Pact on the other; in one word, the conflict between the Eastern *bloc* and the Western *bloc*. Such constellations of great Powers are familiar throughout history. What distinguishes the present situation is the fact that these two *blocs* include virtually the whole world and divide all humanity into two camps of about equal strength. Behind each of these there are two fundamentally different political structures, social and economical systems and cultural "Leitmotive", which make the power-conflict, which is always inherent in such constellations, the more important and dangerous, so that it is only by patient and intelligent statesmanship that the acute crisis, which has existed at least for a year, has not become a catastrophe. What now is the place of the Church within this world-political power-constellation?

It is quite natural to think that such a question of world-politics is one which can interest the Church only negatively, in the sense that the Church has only one concern, that of preservation of peace, of avoiding the catastrophe of war; the Church should not take sides in a question of mere power-relations. While this is true in general, we have to remind ourselves that there have been cases in world-history where the Church with good reason gave up this neutrality-principle. One case is the peril of the Turks in the 16th century, when the whole Christian Occident was in danger of being flooded by that great pagan military Power. It was then that all Christendom, including our great reformers, prayed to God that the progress of this menacing enemy of Christianity might be stopped. To remain neutral would have appeared to every Christian as a betrayal of the Christian cause. A second case belongs to our immediate past. At the time of Hitler's onslaught upon the freedom of the European peoples, all of us, including the better Christians of Germany, prayed with good conscience for the defeat of the regime of totalitarian tyranny and inhumanity, although only few of us went so far as to identify the cause of the Allies with the cause of Jesus Christ and to proclaim a holy Crusade. These two examples may show that even in the field of world power politics the rule of neutrality for the Church is not absolute. Whether this is the case now depends upon whether the ethical character of this issue is equally clear and unambiguous.

The conflict between East and West is not merely a problem of world-power, but includes questions which are much closer to the concerns of the Church, questions which deeply affect the life of the individual man, the character of State and Law, the whole cultural tradition and, last but not least, the freedom of the Church. Whatever may be the attitude which we as Christians have to take, one duty, so often neglected, is clear, we have to know the facts. What are the facts, relevant for the judgment of the Church, behind these catch-words, East and West? We begin with the East.

It seems obvious, that "the East" means the Communism of Russia and her satellites, to which we are accustomed to oppose the Capitalism of the West, in particular of the U.S.A. This formula, however, rather confuses than brings to light the real situation. No doubt, the communist programme of social economic order as formulated by Karl Marx, has been an important factor in the formation of the Soviet State. No doubt, Marxism is there the orthodox dogma, which alone may be taught and which has to be confessed by everyone who wants to rise above the level of bare existence, and which to contradict is a crime. All the same, there is an enormous difference between the intentions of Karl Marx and Soviet reality. Certainly, in Soviet Russia, private property in the means of production is abolished in accordance with the programme of Marx. In the Soviet orbit there is neither private industry, nor private commerce or agriculture. The sole proprietor, the sole producer, the only one who has a say in the whole economy, is the State. While for Marx the State was meant to be a merely transitional factor, intended to create the classless society and then to disappear, in the present-day Soviet system the State is the One and All, not only in economy but in everything. Economically, the Soviet system might be called with more justification a total State-Capitalism, because the place of the private exploiter has been taken by the State, which deprives the individual worker of the just reward of his work in a measure surpassing everything even in the worst times of unrestrained capitalism. What the State leaves of the fruits of work to the ordinary worker is far below what with us the least-paid unskilled worker gets. This is certainly not what Marx had in mind. Above all, that which original Marxism intended, the classless society, is not created. The old bourgeois and feudal class system is replaced by a new one, the hierarchical structure of the Soviet State, an aristocracy of party-functionaries and State-officials rising above the great mass of the work-slaves. The difference between the top class and the bottom proletariat is more akin to the feudal society of the Middle Ages with its high aristocracy and the great mass of peasant-proletariat than anything within the so-called capitalistic world. The formula, so often repeated, 'Justice without Freedom in the East, Freedom without Justice in the West', in no

way corresponds with the facts. In Soviet Russia there is even less social justice than in any Western country.

But this is not the main thing. The Soviet State is the first, and up to now the only, thorough totalitarian state. By that we do not mean dictatorship, or a police-regime. There have always been dictators and police-regimes. The totalitarian system, however, is something quite new. Totalitarian we call that State in which the life of individuals and groups is dominated unconditionally and without any exception by the State, where all sectors of life are dependent entirely upon the will of the State, and where the State does not acknowledge any rights of persons, any autonomy of forms of life limiting the will of the State. This totalitarian State is made possible only by modern techniques and organization. The communist economy, or rather, the totally nationalized economy is merely a part, although a very important part, of this totalitarian State. Hitler's Nazi State was merely a dilettante experiment in totalitarianism for the very reason that the economy was not nationalized. On the other hand, *in abstracto,* communism is conceivable without the totalitarian State. In practice, however, complete nationalization of economy leads necessarily to the totalitarian State, because without material independence there cannot be cultural autonomy and, above all, there can be no political opposition.

The totalitarian State means the abolition of the State of Law. Because the totalitarian State alone creates laws, it is not limited by any law; it is beyond its own laws and beyond limitation by prescribed legal procedure. There are no rights of individuals or groups which the State has to acknowledge. The State can do, and does, whatever it thinks fit. It acknowledges no right but its own will. It is *'legibus solutus'*. That is why the individual has no legal guarantees. Everybody can be at any time arrested, deported, executed with or without the fiction of legal procedure. Finally, the totalitarian State necessarily has a strictly hierarchical structure with a pinnacle of power, dominating everything. The democratic forms are merely a drapery, concealing reality.

In a totalitarian State there can be no freedom. The individual has only such freedom as the State thinks fit to leave him, and as long as the State does so. The individual has no freedom to choose his own work or his workplace, no freedom to organize or to associate with others. Everything, the What and How and Where of work, is ordered by the State. The State has also the absolute monopoly of education, from the elementary school up to the university, from commercial and trade schools up to the academy of art. The State alone publishes newspapers and owns printing presses and paper. The State controls the theatre, the cinema and the radio. The State prescribes to the scientist what he has to teach and to the

musician what kind of music he has to produce. All literature which is deemed unfit is put on the index and cannot be printed, sold nor bought. No student is received in the higher schools without having proved his Marxist political orthodoxy. There cannot exist any free public discussion, nor even any possibility of forming one's own opinion. Man in the totalitarian State is not much more than a State-robot, created to execute the commands of the State. Any resistance, any stirring of freedom, wherever it is discovered, is ruthlessly crushed.

Finally: the Church. It is contrary to the facts to say that the Soviet State is not anti-Christian but merely non-Christian. Atheism belongs to the original Marxist doctrine. By Lenin aggressive atheism was made an essential part of the Soviet programme. The eradication of all religion has never ceased to be one of the final aims of Soviet communism. The Godless movement is organized with the means and encouragement of the State and has not ceased to function. Even after the end of this war the President of the Soviet Republic, Kalinin, openly declared that in spite of the toleration of the Church, the fight against religion continues to be part of the programme of the Soviet republic. Even now, it is impossible for a man of higher position to take part in the life of the Church. Let us not forget that hundreds of thousands of Russians, men and women, were tortured and killed for no other reason than that they were Christians. A new outbreak of persecution can be started at any moment the State thinks fit. Since the end of the war, however, the Soviet State has taken another line. It acknowledges the existence of the Christian Church under the condition that the Church completely surrenders her freedom to the State. Even now the Church is not allowed to instruct children and young people or to embark upon any social or cultural activity. The Church has to buy her right to exist by complete loyalty to the communist State and by public proclamations of her contentment with the present conditions. The 'unfreedom' of the Church in Russia is even now much more menacing than ever it was in Hitler's Germany.

It cannot be denied that this Russian totalitarian State has achieved many great things. It has almost overcome illiteracy and it has done much for public health. Above all, it has produced an industrial development of the giant backward Soviet territory at an almost fantastic tempo, which is admired by those who knew the previous conditions as unquestionable progress, and hailed as the summit of modern civilization by many of those who have no standards of comparison. This industrial development, however, has hardly been a gain for the simple working-man or the farmer, but has remained up to now a potential of industry which serves entirely the purposes of military armament and the luxury of the new élite. Finally, Soviet Russia, by its military power and by

its political and diplomatic technique, has brought the whole of Eastern Europe under her own domination and thereby has realized a large part of Czarist imperialist aims.

All the same, the Soviet State is not a thing peculiarly Russian or Eastern. Its ideology, namely, Marxism, is an entirely Western product. And the totalitarian State is nothing but the final result of Western positivist and materialist philosophy. Russian communism is entirely different from the old original Russian communalism, and all speculations which try to derive this system from Asiatic or Russian traits of character are fantastic. It is the West and not the East which is responsible for this phenomenon of totalitarian communism. That is why it is a judgment on the modern Western spiritual development.

We now come to our second subject, 'the West'. As it is superficial to regard communism as the most characteristic feature of the East, it is even more misleading to speak of capitalism as the distinguishing mark of the West. Quite apart from the ambiguity of the word capitalism, this economic structural element is not that which distinguishes the Western world from the present Eastern one. No doubt, in the Western world there exists, even now, something of what Karl Marx had in mind when he spoke of capitalism. It cannot be denied that even in our day, in no small measure, human labour is exploited in the interest of capital profit. Even now there are giant fortunes and incomes alongside vast numbers of individual existences which hardly rise above the bare minimum of existence. It is true that Western society, in spite of social legislation and in spite of the great achievements of the trade union movement, is far from having solved the problem of social justice. But that kind of capitalism, which Karl Marx had in mind and which he set out to fight, does not exist any more. In this sense it is completely misleading to speak of the capitalistic West.

In saying this, we do not intend in the least to make an apologia for the West. Quite the contrary. There is no stronger evidence of the dangerous course of the spiritual development of the Western world within the last centuries, that is, in the time of the so-called emancipation from Christian faith and Christian ethical standards, than the fact that the final result of this Western development is the totalitarian State. It is high time that those in the West, who are loudest in protesting against Russian totalitarian inhumanity, make clear to themselves that the positivist and materialistic philosophy, out of which both the Bolshevist and the Nazi-totalitarianism have developed, is the same as that which nowadays is the dominating philosophy of our Western universities and higher schools. It is not Russia, but it is the secularized Western world, which has produced that mentality out of which the totalitarian State rises of necessity. If, in the West, totalitarianism has not yet become an acute danger

(although the example of France may show how close we are to that danger), it is because there are still certain spiritual and institutional reserves, accumulated during a time when it was not positivism or materialism but a Christian philosophy of life, which formed the structure of Europe. But do not let us deceive ourselves: these reserves are being rapidly used up. If the Western world does not soon relinquish this course of 'emancipation' from the Christian foundations, even the West will not be able to avoid the totalitarian outcome.

Up to now, however, these reserves are still, although less and less so, characteristic features of the West, much more so than capitalism, which has long ago passed its acme. Amongst these features the most important is not democracy, but the supremacy of law. In spite of all sinister aspects of Western countries and conditions of life, the West has retained a respect for law which distinguishes it from the complete lawlessness of the totalitarian State. The greatest example of this estimate of law as the basis of all free human society is England. The English people still know that law is not a product of the State, but precedes the State, that the State is not meant to produce the law, but to safeguard it, that there are rights born with us, rights of man which no State is entitled to upset.

Second, the West has retained something which must be considered as a direct product of centuries-long Christian education and which is a dominant factor, even where the consciousness of its Christian origin has been lost, the sense of the dignity of the human life and person and of the destiny of man to be free. If that sense is called liberalism, I should say that liberalism, much more than democracy, is the safest safeguard against inhuman totalitarianism. It is true that this Western liberalism has been combined since the time of enlightenment with another idea, which in itself has nothing to do with it and which in its own turn has had very dangerous results, namely, individualism. The rationalist philosophy of enlightenment understood freedom as freedom of the individual alone, while in the Christian understanding of freedom, individual freedom and social solidarity are always combined with each other. Nevertheless in our time, when collectivism is by far the greatest menace to society, liberalism, even in its idealistic form, has to be considered as a positive value. If we were living still in the time of 'Manchester-capitalism', this judgment could hardly stand. But the *laissez-faire* ideal of that high capitalism, which is the typical product of an individualist conception of man, belongs to the past, although there are certain unteachable individuals who wish for those past times to come back. But these fools cannot turn back the wheel of history, which has long ago decided against them.

The third factor characteristic of the West is democracy.

Nowadays, democracy is understood as that form of the State in which Government or Parliament is elected by the majority-vote of the people. It should be noticed, however, that those nations, which were the first in modern history to create democratic States, namely, Switzerland, England and U.S.A., were wise enough not to stake everything on this one card of the majority principle. They knew well enough that the majority can be a tyrant for minorities, and that the majority of today can make decisions which are not in the interest of the people of tomorrow. Moreover, they knew something of the instability of a mere majority regime. For these reasons they created counterweights, such as the two-Chamber system, a constitution independent of a temporary majority, and the acknowledgment of political traditions. How wise they were in doing so we have learned from modern history, where in certain cases the bare majority rule has led to the brink of anarchy, in another case to the election of a dictator, who in a very short time transformed a 'State-of-Law' into a totalitarian State, which in its turn brought with it a whole system of the most dreadful inhumanity, cruelty and tyranny. Majority rule as such is neither a safeguard against anarchy nor against totalitarian tyranny. But democracy, combined and secured with those counterweights, is the most humane form of civil order.

What is to be said about the contrast of the Christian West and the God-less East? Of course this formula is a tremendous exaggeration. That the East is God-less, so far as the political system controlling all life is concerned, is beyond any controversy. It is the first time in world history, that a State publicly proclaims and propagates atheism and makes it the basis of its whole political social and cultural system. Already original Marxism is much more firmly linked up with atheism than most people know. But it was only through Lenin that atheism became aggressive and that Communism put the eradication of all religion on its programme. This atheism, however, as we have already said, is not the product of Karl Marx, much less of the Russian nation, but is the last phase of the Western secularist movement. The East gives back to the West its fruit of the Western seed, a seed which not only belongs to the past, but which is sown nowadays more extensively than ever in the West. It is bitterly ironical that the same States, which today arm themselves, with enormous sacrifice, against the Eastern menace, spend enormous sums also for a system of education, which produces that very spirit out of which totalitarianism has grown and must grow.

That is why it is hypocrisy to speak of a Christian West. All the same, this word is not quite without truth. It is true that even in this secularized West there have remained those elements of Christian tradition of which we have spoken. It is true that in

this secularized West there still exists a Christian Church. It is true, on the other hand, that even the totalitarian communist State has not been able to destroy the Christian Church in the East and that this Eastern Christianity has probably gained as much in depth as it has lost in numbers by persecution. The great difference however is this, that in the West the Church enjoys complete freedom and has the possibility of influencing public life (however small this influence of the Christian minority may be), while in the East it has lost its liberty and is excluded under threat of martyrdom and death from all influence upon public affairs. In this very relative sense there is a difference between the God-less East and the Christian West. This difference however is disappearing more and more quickly with the increase of secularism.

So far I have brought to our consciousness some of the facts which must be known in order to determine the attitude of the Church to the problem of East and West. Before defining this attitude let me deal with a few arguments to the effect that the Church should not deal with the problem at all. The first is, that the Church has no reason to bother about the problem because she is not endangered. Anyone who says so must have forgotten that there are millions of Christians living under the tyranny and aggressive God-lessness of totalitarian Communism, that there are at this very moment hundreds of Christians in Eastern countries living in prisons and concentration camps or as deported slaves. Should our solidarity with them be so weak that we do not consider their sufferings as ours? And apart from that, are we in Western Europe so sure that their fate will not be ours before long? Is it then not time to make up our mind as to the character of this power threatening the freedom of the Church and brutally trampling down all laws of humanity? And finally, is it right to desert the Christians in the Eastern countries, who carry the responsibility for their political attitude to the Eastern world-power, and refuse them help in trying to get clear in their minds their Christian responsibilities for the politics of their country? It seems to me that the slogan of neutrality comes out of a very limited middle-European point of view, and a point of view which even for the middle-European is an irresponsible ostrich policy. The second argument says that to speak out against Communism is not justified because it is now without any danger and therefore is cheap. Again we have to be reminded that for millions of Christians to speak out what they think would mean torture and death. If *we* remain silent, will not they who cannot speak, reproach us that we, for whom it is not dangerous now, do not say those things which they cannot without facing martyrdom of the most terrible kind? Was it really, in the time of Hitler, so dangerous in Switzerland or in

England to say what Nazi-terrorism meant? But in any case, since when is danger a criterion of the necessity of speaking out the truth? A third argument says that a public Church proclamation about Communism has no recognizable meaning or purpose, because such a statement could not have the form of a Church-confession. However, quite apart from the fact that confession is not the only possible way for the Church to deal with present-day questions, might not the moment have come, when the Church *ought* to proclaim its judgment about totalitarian Communism in the form of a confessional statement, after it had missed this opportunity in Amsterdam? Fourthly, it is said, such a negative proclamation on Communism would endanger the peace of the world. This, however, is a dubious argument. The policy of appeasement, which was followed 10 years ago, did not prove to be a very commendable means to preserve peace. On the contrary, the clearer the Western nations, including the Christians, become with regard to the Eastern menace and the more determined they are to defend themselves against it, the smaller will be the danger of a catastrophy.

What then can be the positive meaning of a definition of the Church's attitude? The Church has the right and the obligation to know what the whole East-West conflict is about. The Church has this right because her own interests are at stake. She has this obligation because her own members are responsible for their nation's policy. The Church has the obligation to make her own members conscious of the deadly threat which totalitarian Communism is for herself and for all humanity and all human values. She has this obligation too, because within her own ranks there are a good many who are blind to this danger and let themselves be fooled by the propaganda catch-words of social justice and by the ambiguity of the word communism, so that they regard this truly devilish system of inhumanity as a serious possibility of social order.

This obligation to speak out against totalitarian Communism must not be impaired by the other duty to fight against the social and spiritual evils in the West. This ought to be done, and the other not left undone. This obligation to speak out against this greatest and deadliest of all social evils, the totalitarian State, is so much greater because, not without the guilt of the Church, has it come into existence. Christianity must declare without ambiguity and out of the depth of the Christian conscience that totalitarianism as it is represented in the communist State, is irreconcilable with Christianity and this unconditional No should not be weakened by speaking at the same time a similar No against capitalism.

Capitalism, whatever that may be, is not a political system comparable to totalitarianism, determining the entire life of man. It

is the task of the Church to make clear that Capitalism and totalitarian Communism are not comparable evils. If by Capitalism we mean reckless profiteering and self-assertion of economic privilege, it is not a system, but an attitude. If, however, we understand capitalism in the very definite sense which Karl Marx gave this word, it means *any* kind of economic structure which is not communist. The Church is certainly bound to condemn capitalism in the first sense, but it is not the duty of the Church to condemn capitalism in the sense of Karl Marx, meaning all possible alternatives to Communism

There are amongst us a good many honest Christians, who believe it their duty to postulate the nationalization of economy in the name of justice. To these let me give the following reminders. It is true, that in the last hundred years we have learned that unlimited economic freedom, as it was advocated by the individualistic liberalism of the Manchester school, is a great danger to social justice and to a truly human condition of economic life. We have recognized that there must be certain restraints put upon economic liberty and that the nation as a whole must protect its interests against egoistic misuse of liberty by a certain measure of State legislation and economic planning. This protection has been given in a large degree, both by the activity of the trade unions and by social legislation. This, however, has nothing to do with nationalization of economy. Nowadays we must ask very earnestly whether in Europe there is not more need to protect man's freedom against the State. The world has changed a great deal since the times of Ricardo and of the slogans of Free Trade. Everywhere collectivists displace and suppress individual life; everywhere we see the tendency to expect everything from the State and therefore to increase State competences and bureaucracy. Even where the State has no dictatorial or totalitarian intentions, it is forced by the new duties put upon it to regiment more and more the life of man and to narrow the sphere of freedom. Therefore the Church to-day must fight just as much for a certain range of freedom for the individual as for that justice which can reasonably be expected of social legislation.

Certainly, I repeat it, there is still a great deal of economic injustice in our Western world. It is still true that the weak get too little and the strong too much; there are still conditions unworthy of man, and the State has still a great task in coming to the aid of the weak through social legislation and economic planning. But nationalization of economy is the wrong way, for to the degree that it approaches total control it leads, whether you want it or not, to the totalitarian State. Nationalization is justified in certain specific cases, but as a general rule it cannot but lead

to totalitarianism. Therefore all those who, from excellent motives, favour nationalization of economy are instrumental, although against their intention, in preparing the way for the totalitarian State.

There are other means than nationalization to correct the evil outgrowths of a non-State economy. There is a kind of social legislation which serves individual liberty. It is necessary to subject to severe criticism our present laws governing corporations, which were created in a time of individualism that identified freedom with unlimited individual rights. There are other ways still to limit individual freedom in the interest of society as a whole. The opinion, however, that nationalization would create a just social order is a pernicious superstitition, which the Church should not countenance.

The State is a very good thing if it serves and does not dominate. The State, however, becomes a most terrific evil, wherever it tends to arrogate everything to itself in order to dominate it. This tendency in our day is not only to be found in the East; this State-superstition is rampant in almost all Western countries as well. People hate totalitarian Communism, but they do not know what its roots are. They fight dictatorship; they hate the secret police and torturing; but they have not yet understood that these are mere symptoms which appear of necessity wherever the State dominates life. The totalitarian State begins with total nationalization of economy. Every step forward on this road is a step forward to that most dreadful end. Everyone who has seen that totalitarianism is the maximum of injustice and inhumanity must also oppose everything leading to this end.

What, then, you may ask impatiently, has all this to do with the Church? You are right to ask this question. But let me remind you that all that we have been speaking of is centred round the question: What can we do to get a just and humane social order and to avoid that order which kills the human person and makes him a State-robot in the name of social justice? The totalitarian State is the leviathan of our epoch, incomparably the greatest social evil, which destroys not only freedom and humanity, but also justice. Who should be expected to champion freedom, humanity and justice if not the Church? Who else can really see the monster, at a time when men are so confused that in their just indignation about the injustices of our world they throw themselves into the mouth of leviathan? Because the Church is entrusted with the knowledge of human sin, she alone is capable of seeing the supreme danger lying in the omnipotence of the State. Whoever has kept a sense of proportion cannot but see how tragically ridiculous it is to put on the same level the evils of capitalism with the evil of the

communist totalitarian State. Western society, it is true, has not yet done away with all the evils arising from the so-called capitalist system. But Western society has at least come to grips with it. The danger in our time is on the other side that, even in democratic countries with a great liberal tradition, the way is being prepared for the greatest of all social evils through lack of insight. I am thinking of Socialism. Socialism may be a very good thing; if it is not merely another name for what Karl Marx meant by the word and what he also called communism. State-socialism is only another name for communism and it will produce the same terrible symptoms of the totalitarian State.

What we need is a liberal socialism or a social liberalism, that is, a combination of individual freedom and solidarity. State-socialism, however, is Communism and Communism is the totalitarian State. It is no chance that Karl Marx was a convinced and outspoken atheist and materialist. Atheism and materialism are the necessary pre-suppositions of his economic system. Certainly his intentions were noble. He did not yet know, however, what we have since learned, that collectivism is State-capitalism and finally totalitarianism. He could not yet foresee the necessity which was to lead Lenin beyond himself and Stalin beyond Lenin. We, however, know it and should draw the conclusions.

The Church between East and West—we know that this is an illusion. The Church has not to defend Western civilization against Eastern barbarism, because this Eastern barbarism is the child of the West. The task of the Church is to show which elements of the West created the devilries of the East and to call the Western nations to repentance for them. The Church in the West is duty-bound to say to our brethren in the East: We know your distress; we know your oppressor; we suffer with you, and we hate with you that system against which you dare not even open your mouth. But we speak out FOR you, that you may know that your suffering is our suffering and your foe is our foe. We do not judge you if you try to find some *modus vivendi* with the oppressor, but we ask you to remain firm in your heart and spirit, where the word and the deed is denied to you. If you cannot avoid making outward concessions, do not make them inwardly. But be sure, we shall honour every one of you, who has the courage and the strength for martyrdom. We shall despise with you everyone who has run over into the camp of the foe, everyone who openly calls him a friend instead of an enemy, a liberator instead of an oppressor, a man of justice instead of injustice.

Many Christians of the East have no more ardent wish than that the West declare war on their oppressor. They say, How else can we become free from this system of oppression and tyranny?

But at this point we have to disappoint our brothers in the East. We cannot call to war; we cannot even wish for war. The evils of modern warfare are too great and the danger of general annihilation and universal chaos is too imminent to justify this ultimate resort. On the contrary, the Church has to do everything which lies in her power to preserve peace and to avoid the catastrophy of war. We believe, however, that unreserved clarity of opposition is the best, in fact the only, guarantee of peace. Because all the democratic nations hate war, they must be united only by the inward, spiritual opposition against leviathan, to such a degree that the monster is not misled again by the love of peace in the West into believing that he can do everything, without fearing the consequences.

One last positive word. What we can and what we must do in the West is to show the East our determination to solve the problem of social justice in a better way. Whatever we do in this respect will be known in the course of time in the East, in spite of the Iron Curtain. The more we do that, the less will the propaganda of totalitarian Communism be efficient. But if it is true that the devilries of the East have their origin in the West, no fundamental betterment can be hoped for apart from the return of Western society to its Christian foundations. The first duty of the Church is to create within herself that community which does not oppress, but affirms the freedom of every member. The Gospel, which is entrusted to the Church, is a Gospel of communion in freedom and freedom in communion. Preaching this Gospel is the Church's first duty; but preaching is not enough. The Church is meant to *be* a *communio sanctorum*. Had the Church been true to this task we should perhaps have had no totalitarian Communism. A true Christian community is the only sufficient answer to that Communism, which turns the *communio* into its very opposite. This Christian Communism is the task of the Church in our day. We have hardly begun to see it. God help us to make a serious start on this way and to follow it with determination.

JEWRY, JUDAISM, ISRAEL

By James Parkes, M.A., D.Phil., Hon. D.H.L.

Two important points are often forgotten by Christians when they consider the contemporary Jewish situation. The first is the massacre at the hands of Hilter of two-fifths of the whole Jewish people. Deep in our subconscious minds, I suppose, we desire to forget this tragedy; but a Jew cannot, and it affects his whole thinking on many issues concerning Jewry and its relation with other peoples. The second is more elusive. It is the effect on Jewish life and religion of centuries of humiliation, misrepresentation, restriction and persecution. A young Jewish intellectual of the twelfth century might, for various reasons, have become a Christian. But his motive would certainly not have been the larger intellectual life, the greater spiritual freedom to be found in Christendom. For the reverse was true. Orthodox Judaism offered him a freer range and a wider scope of enquiry than scholastic Christianity. But in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries many young Jews did flee from the Jewish community, not out of religious conviction, but because the world outside the Ghetto offered them these wider opportunities, and the Ghetto world denied them. What had been a flexible, alert, and vigorous religious community had taken on some of the aspects of an intellectual and spiritual prison. Within that prison were still many saints, a high standard of personal conduct, and a deep and fruitful mysticism; but religious forms had grown hard and brittle, tolerance had perished, and the multiplication of observances had lost all significance to those who failed to catch the spirit behind them. Ghetto Orthodoxy had lost intellectual suppleness with the disappearance of new real problems in a life which was restricted on all sides and offered no opportunity for enlargement. It was not touched by reforming movements in Judaism because it was unrelated to the new problems which reforms were designed to meet.

Both of these facts have a continuing effect. The attitude towards the Jews which made possible the massacres is still showing itself in the anti-Semitism of contemporary Europe; its persistence explains both the anger of American Jewry with Britain over Palestine, and the determination of Israel's resistance both to the Arab armies and to the compromises of various proposed solutions of the Jewish-Arab conflict. Likewise the breach with Orthodoxy, though paralleled by the drift from religion within the Christian world, shows itself in the upbuilding of a whole way of life in Israel which, though it is a direct inheritance of rabbinic Judaism, is both in conflict with the Orthodox parties, and in turn violently opposed by them.

If we could arrange history to suit our convenience, we could reasonably argue that it would be wise to allow the Jewish world time to rally its forces from the appalling disaster of the war and post-war years, before any vital decisions had to be taken as to its political future; and we could equally plausibly argue that Jewish Orthodoxy should have time to adjust itself to the modern world before it was asked to take decisions in a wide political field in which its inexperience is accentuated by the fact that centuries of Ghetto life deprived Jews of all political responsibility. But history does not work that way; and in the midst of its internal crisis, Jews are called to the understanding and solution of a whole series of fresh problems; and Jewish Orthodoxy, by its very nature, has developed into a political party in Israel, and has to take a direct responsibility in the experimental decisions of a new State.

To range over all the problems involved in this situation is beyond the scope of a single article; but, without attempting priorities of importance, it is possible to select two whose novelty entitle them to attention. Both are concerned with the emergence of Israel. There is, on the one hand, the problem of dual loyalties for Jews still living as citizens of other countries; and, on the other, there is the problem of religion in Israel. Both are linked in the enigma of the unique relationship between the Jewish people and their religion throughout the ages, as well as complicated by the stresses of our present divided world.

So far as the formal field is concerned, Jewry has already taken wise decisions about the relations of Israel to the Jews elsewhere. Up to the establishment of the State, the direction of the whole enterprise of the National Home was in the hands of the Jewish Agency and its many allied bodies, and the Agency represented British, American and continental as well as Palestinian Jews. At its first meeting after the establishment of the State, a conflict arose over the position of those members who had now become ministers and officials of Israel. These saw no reason to resign their membership of the Agency; but those who were not members of the Israeli State argued firstly, that an Agency containing a substantial proportion of the Israeli cabinet could only be a half-baked second government of Israel, and secondly that they who were not citizens of Israel could not take part in its internal political decisions, as they would be bound to do if half their members were the political leaders of Israel. In the end this opinion prevailed, and the Agency now represents the activities and opinions of Jews, whether citizens of Israel or any other State, but has no direct power over, or responsibility for, the government of Israel. Yet its functioning is still vital to Israel; for there is no question but that for many years to come the infant State will need very extensive financial assistance, especially from America; and, of course, the extent to which Jews

elsewhere will give will be bound to depend on their confidence in the spending of their money in Israel. But this is not the only field of direct contact. The position of Jews in many countries is very difficult and in some, particularly in the Muslim world, dangerous. There has been a tendency to think that the establishment of a Jewish state will automatically give Jewry a means of political pressure it previously lacked. This is a very doubtful proposition. In individual cases it may be true; for Israel will be able to bargain, like any other State, about matters of interest to her citizens. But she cannot go further; and in a good many countries constant political intervention on behalf of Jewish citizens of those countries might embitter rather than improve their lot.

There will still be an enormous field for the voluntary work, often heartbreaking in its vastness, of such bodies as the World Jewish Congress, the American Joint Distribution Committee, and a dozen other organizations. The work of the Congress is primarily political, of the 'Joint' primarily economic; but both are natural developments against the democratic background of the Western world. Yet while they are natural developments, they are also expressions of the anomalous position of Jewry, an anomaly which is intensified by the emergence of Israel. The paradox resides in this: factually, historically and religiously the Jews are a people. Politically they are not, and have not been since the abolition of the Jewish patriarchate by the emperor Theodosius II in A.D. 435. And the emergence of Israel has still not made them politically a single people. At present there is a threefold attitude among Jews to this paradox. The extreme Zionists desire to act as though the major political loyalty for all Jews was to Israel; the moderates, including probably the bulk of British and American Jewry, recognize that in political loyalties their major responsibilities lie to the country of their citizenship. The out-and-out Assimilationists hold that the only link between Jews is a religious one, and many of them are still hostile to the emergence of any Jewish State at all.

If the estimate that the second position covers the majority of Jews be correct, then one can say that they have taken, like the Jewish Agency, the right formal decision. But this is not necessarily going to save them from many difficult individual choices, choices which may sometimes seem to align Jewish groups and individuals against their non-Jewish environment. Here all we can do is to recognize that this is not due to any Jewish intention, let alone malice, but is only an extreme form of the dilemma of multiple loyalties to which we are all subject. For the idea that our natural, professional, political and religious loyalties all fit exactly into the frontiers of a sovereign State, unless we happen to be Jews, is entirely mythical.

We can then take comfort from the fact that in the formal field the new alignments which have accompanied the emergence of Israel are on sound lines, and it would be excessive to ask more at the present time. Mistakes will doubtless be made, corners will be reached which are difficult to turn; but in the main, Jewry has responded wisely to its difficult and anomalous situation, and is entitled to all the help which outsiders can give in the solution of the day to day problems which will emerge.

As many of the actual problems which will arise will come within the wide, if vague, sphere of 'moral' problems, their difficulty and intensity, as well as the extent to which they will carry non-Jewish sympathy, will naturally depend on the nature of the Israeli State which emerges. If current propaganda were correct in its simultaneous suggestions that Israel is sold to Communism, that it is blood-drunk with imperialism, that it is intolerant of all religious or other minorities, then the position of Jews in countries like Britain and U.S.A. might become agonising; for they would feel called to support Israel in conduct which, as British or American citizens, they would deplore and fight in Britain and America. In fact, the situation is not so desperate. All the available evidence, especially that of the Israeli elections, is that current propaganda is not correct. This does not mean that there is no reason for anxiety about the immediate problems confronting Israel—the establishment of peace, the frontiers of the new State, and the future of that section of the Arab refugees who originally had homes in what will become Israeli territory. But the evidence provided in most of the British Press is so one-sided that it forms no basis for a fair judgment. The refugees offer an outstanding example of this bias; for it is not mentioned that their numbers exceed by several hundred thousand the total Arab population of territory ever in the hands of Israel, and that the responsibility for the plight of this large number rests entirely on the shoulders of the Arab armies and the Arab states.

But, if we cannot yet judge of the morality of the solution of these immediate problems, there is material on which we can form an estimate as to the character of the Israeli State, taken both from contemporary events and from the history which lies behind the Zionist Movement.

To set these in their true perspective we must look for a moment at the tremendous tasks and responsibilities which lie on this generation of Jews and Israeli. The Jewish population of Israel, when the State was declared, amounted to just under 700,000, including 100,000 in Jerusalem. It has already increased to 900,000 by immigration from Europe, and is now growing at the rate of 30,000 a month. A possible solution of the Arab problem may lie along the lines of an exchange of population with the Jews of Cairo, Damascus, Baghdad and elsewhere in the Arab world. This would

mean an immigration of some hundreds of thousands of an oriental, urban proletariat, with a few wealthy merchants, but with no experience either of democracy, Western systems of taxation and social services, or of agriculture. In a few years the pre-1948 members of the National Home are likely to be little more than a third of the total population of Israel, faced with the task of passing on their own high standards of life to a majority containing an undue proportion of citizens whose long years in hiding, in concentration and in D.P. camps have sapped their vitality and made them to a greater or lesser extent permanent neurotics, and another large group lacking experience of the elements of the Western standard of life of Israel. Apart from the financial and physical effort required, the spiritual and mental strain is going to be terrific; and there is bound to be an element of exceptional uncertainty in all prognostications.

With this warning we can, however, examine the present situation with a certain confidence. The most important factor has undoubtedly been the Israeli elections, elections which were free and without pressures of the kind to which we have become too accustomed in many countries. The defeat both of the "imperialist" Revisionists and the Communists is too striking to be ignored. The Revisionists, who were allied to the Irgun Zwai Leumi, only achieved the fourth place, in spite of all the glamour that their underground work gave them, and the passions that war arouses; and the Communists came very nearly at the bottom. More than a third of the whole vote went to the Labour Party—a party with much the same non-communist, non-totalitarian ideology as British Labour—and they were followed, though at a considerable distance, by the Left Wing Labour Party and the Orthodox Religious Party. These three together account for well over half the votes. There are other interesting indications in the present situation. In the election itself three Arab parties freely voted and elected members to the Assembly. Apart from the election a matter of special interest has been the treatment of Arab and Christian minorities. In and during the fighting there were a number of painful and even abominable incidents. They were not confined to the Israeli side, nor are they a phenomenon peculiar to the Jewish-Arab war. But what is interesting is that they not merely did not have official support, but that they were condemned by Israeli public opinion and by almost the whole Israeli press. Moreover, in spite of early rumours, it is now clear that the Government and military authorities did their best to protect the holy places of other religions, and that Christian and Muslim congregations have been safeguarded and assisted to carry on their religious life.

The three parties which have commanded over half the votes in Israel contain the answer to the question: what is the relationship

of Israel to Judaism, and what is the significance of Israel to Jews in the rest of the world? At the extremes, the Revisionists on one side and the Communists on the other, we are confronted with parties which are parallel to similar parties elsewhere; there is nothing specifically 'Jewish' about them. But these three parties have characteristics that do not arise simply out of the contemporary political situation, but which, in varying measure and in spite of their mutual opposition, are attempting to express the dreams of rabbinic Judaism. On their success will depend not merely the future of Israel, but the psychological revival of Jewry elsewhere, as well as the nature of its relationship with Israel.

Judaism is constantly misunderstood by Christian enquirers, because they judge it simply as an alternative religion to Christianity, seeking the same objectives by the same paths. They judge it by its capacity to save the sinner and to bring him to salvation. But these are not the primary objectives in Judaism which is, throughout, the religion of a community, seeking to express in daily life the will of God for human society. Judaism is not indifferent to the individual, for the true community must be built of responsible persons, not of robots. In fact, in its completely unpriestly and congregational form Judaism insists as much as Congregationalism on the direct responsibility which each man bears before God. But it has never stopped there. The further emphasis has always been on the holy community, in this world, and fulfilling the will of God in all the departments of the life of men in society. That is why it has always been less interested in the future life than the Christian Churches, and why its historic literature contains, not the continual theological discussions of Christian patristics, but ever more detailed examination of the duty of man in every possible, and indeed impossible, situation.

For many centuries this interest found adequate expression in the life of the synagogue, and in the study and discussion of the Talmud and the vast mass of rabbinic literature. But as the range of that life became narrower the discussion became more and more unrealistic. Hence when cracks appeared in the Ghetto walls, the pattern of life offered by Orthodoxy appeared unsatisfying to an increasing number of Jews who still retained the desire in their hearts that rabbinic Judaism had implanted, that they should express in their lives and aspirations the divine purpose for human society. The situation had its parallels in the Christian world; but side by side with a movement for religious reform of the kind with which the Protestant Churches were familiar in nineteenth-century history, there was an even stronger movement in Jewry for building that juster society, even without the help of an Orthodoxy which appeared to have lost itself entirely in a rigid formalism.

For some time the two movements lived apart, scarcely touching

each other. Jews, emancipated in western Europe and America, found their satisfaction in plunging into all the movements for social righteousness of the nineteenth-century democratic world, and, in fact, initiated many of them. But one factor in Judaism and in Jewish history brought them inevitably together again—the never abandoned Messianic dream of restoration in the land of Israel. It had always been a pious action for a Jew to go to live in the Promised Land; and, when the desolation wrought by the rapacity and misgovernment of the Turks, the incessant feuds of the fellaheen and the raids and goats of the bedouin, had made it impossible for these pilgrim immigrants to find means of supporting themselves, the Jewish communities of the world supported them. Hence arose that group in the Jewish population which forms the backbone of the Orthodox movement of the Agudath Israel, or Agudah. They did not owe their presence in Jerusalem to Zionism, and they were, until 1945, opposed to the whole political Zionist programme, believing that no political change could be made until the Messiah came.

Yet, as they testified by their presence, it was a righteous act to settle in the land of Israel. Hence side by side with an anti-orthodox Zionism arose a movement of Orthodox Jews in eastern Europe which found it impossible to challenge the further development of this idea, that it was also a righteous act to work for the recovery of the soil of Israel, so that it could support a larger Jewish population by their own work, and not by charity. There were thus always Orthodox Jews who supported the reconstruction programme of Zionism, while hesitant at first and divided about ultimate political objectives. They formed the Mizrachi Party within the Zionist Organization. They have combined with the Agudah in the present elections to put forward the demand for the fulfilment of rabbinic law and tradition within the new State. Their demands perfectly reflect their background. They speak of the Sabbath, of shechita and of the marriage laws. These were matters within the purview of a Ghetto community, and on them an immense volume of rabbinical exegesis has been reared. But, however important they may be, a sovereign State has much more difficult matters to which it must give priority, especially one in the situation of Israel. Orthodoxy will only find its feet when its religious inspiration enables it to speak on issues such as the Arab refugees, the conditions of new immigrants, the treatment of minorities, and many other questions, all of which have the deepest moral significance, but on which they cannot turn to tradition for authoritative guidance. There is a big spiritual conflict before the Orthodox Party and it is too soon to foresee when it will come and how it will be solved. But it must come, because a Jewish religious party cannot accept the solution of

retiring from political life and proclaiming a separation between the life of the Church and of society.

To those who had abandoned Orthodoxy the appeal of the land of Israel presented itself with equal force, but with a different accent. The persecution in Russia after the death of Alexander II in 1881; the rise of anti-Semitism all through central Europe in the '80s, and the Dreyfus trial in France in 1894, all lent strength to the argument that only by the recovery of a national status of their own would Jews escape the injustices of life under the pressure of alien masters; and this was reinforced by the belief that only as Jewish life did become independent would Jews throw off those deformities which life in the diaspora with its legal and social restrictions has imposed on them. As the majority of Jews lived in eastern Europe, and the majority of eastern European Jews belonged to the poorer classes, the form which these dreams took was a combination of these Jewish aspirations with those of their Gentile environment, Marxian and non-Marxian socialist as much as, or more than, middle-class nationalist.

Out of this background grew the powerful Zionist Labour Party which, some years ago, split into Marxist and non-Marxist sections. The division is in no sense along the lines of what has been called the present Kremlinism of the Soviet Union. The Marxist Labour Party is no more totalitarian than the other; it is in its interpretation of history and its philosophy, not in its political activity, that it follows Marx. It is more hostile to religion than the Labour Party, which is not only ready for political co-operation with the Orthodox Parties, but has always been willing to emphasise that its programme and way of life are an interpretation of the striving for social justice and mutual responsibility of Orthodox Judaism, and that what it has rejected are but ceremonial and ritual forms which are no longer relevant, and a historical theology which is no longer tenable.

It is out of the clashes between the Labour Party and the Orthodox Party that new religious forms are likely to be born. So far no organised reformed synagogue has appeared in Israel, and diaspora forms of reform are not appropriate. But all the time the Bible, wedded to the land, is exercising a powerful influence on Jewish life; the rabbinic and prophetic summons to social righteousness is felt by thousands who reject the interpretations of the Orthodox; the parallels between the present situation and that of Biblical days stir emotions throughout the Jewish world. The very vastness of the problems which confront the infant State provoke a feeling of consecration and humility much deeper than the cocksureness superficial observers notice. It will be only in the name of religion that a challenge to Orthodoxy will

be effective; for, as already said, Judaism may permit the widest toleration but it cannot accept that kind of separation between the spheres of Church and State that Europe inherited from post-Reformation history. The close links between Israel and the diaspora will guarantee that the religious struggle in Israel will be reflected in Jewish life elsewhere, and it is indeed only by interaction between Israel and the diaspora, giving and receiving on the material as well as the spiritual plane, in terms of the actual problems with which the Jewish people is struggling, that a new Orthodoxy, which is itself reformed, will be born. Judaism is totalitarian only in the sense that it must cover the whole of life. In the diaspora it could not do so. The laws of the land had also to be observed. In Israel there will be no laws save those which the Jewish people make. As Orthodoxy recovers from its narrow Ghetto experience it will feel responsible in relation to all of them. But so also will the other parties; and so the day to day struggle of a democratic State and not the study or the synagogue will be the field of religious rebirth.

AN AMERICAN APPRAISAL OF THE AMSTERDAM ASSEMBLY

By Henry Smith Leiper, D.D.

At this early date no one can presume to make a comprehensive and authentic statement concerning the long-term historical significance of the First World Assembly of the World Council of Churches. The event is too recent and its implications too complex and momentous. Yet the thing that happened at 11.35 a.m. on the morning of the 23rd August, in the Concertgebauw in Amsterdam, has already brought forth a volume of news reporting and comment unprecedented where Church matters are concerned. More than six miles of news columns in 1,600 dailies and scores of weekly periodicals give evidence of the public interest which the event evoked and which drew to Amsterdam more than 300 reporters. And the end of that reporting is not yet. All over America more than five hundred Americans who were there in one capacity or another are reporting their impressions to eager and responsive audiences, and the Press continues to carry the reports of these reports.

History only too plainly shows that the real meaning of an historic event is not by any means always grasped at the time it takes place. The files of American newspapers, for example, reveal that on the 17th December, 1903, the people of Dayton, Ohio, were informed that "two bicycle mechanics" well known in that city would "be home for Christmas after their trip to Kitty Hawk, North Carolina". Not a line appeared with respect to what happened there when, for the first time in history, man flew a heavier-than-air machine under its own power. It was an event destined to alter the whole of man's history and to shatter forever the shift from "flat-map mindedness" to "global consciousness". It made inevitable the realignment of national power groupings. It marked the passing of civilization from the age of steam to the Air age. But all that was hidden from those who first reported what happened even in the home city of the inventors who first achieved sustained flight.

Much that is potentially involved in what happened at Amsterdam is probably as little discerned by most of those who report it to the world as was the real meaning of the Wright Brothers' achievement by those who first heard of it. Yet it seems safe even now to predict that just as the event at Kitty Hawk in 1903 meant the end of national isolation so the event at

Amsterdam in 1948 means the end of denominational or confessional isolation. As Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of the largest Protestant Church in America—the Methodist—said before the event: "The Church historian of the future will probably say that the most important event in the twentieth century was the founding of the World Council of Churches, because it marked the beginning of the end of denominational separateness and divisiveness". In this, significantly enough, the American Bishop seems to have agreed with William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, who, likewise before the consummation of the provisional existence of the World Council, said: "It is the great fact of our time: here is one ground of hope for the future days".

Too much stress can hardly be put on the fact that an official Council of the Churches, consisting of one hundred and fifty constituent bodies and representing every major type of Christian Church except the Roman, could have been formed with complete unanimity. It is significant that this should have happened when, for the first time in history, the Christian Church has established at least a nucleus in every nation under heaven (a fact to which Dr. Kenneth Scott Latourette, most distinguished American Church historian of our time, bears witness). This action is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that these official Church delegates were not merely assenting to a beautiful idea as something which *might be* but endorsing and consummating a venture in Christian unity, which had already been *going on* provisionally for a decade during the most troubled period in the life of the world.

* * *

What was seen here was the restoration, in some degree at least, of what might be termed the catholicity of Protestantism, and of ties between the East and the West. As to the first, one is reminded of a paragraph from d'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation":

> "The catholicity of the Reformation is a noble feature in its character. The Germans pass into Switzerland; the French into Germany; in latter times men from England and Scotland pass over to the Continent, and doctors from the Continent into Great Britain. The reformers in the different countries spring up almost independently of one another; but no sooner are they born than they hold out the right hand of fellowship. There is among them one sole faith, one spirit, one Lord. From their very origin the Protestant Churches form a 'whole body fitly framed together'."

As for the second—the coming together of parts of the Orthodox Eastern Church with the heirs of the Reformation whose Mother

Church split with the East in 1054 A.D.—it is a more difficult type of co-operation, and largely indefinable theologically, but that it is increasingly real will be seen by any who come into contact with it. Dramatic evidence of it was seen at times in the presidency over the Assembly of Archbishop Germanos, Titular Bishop of Thyatira and representative of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Stanboul, who was re-elected to the Presidium; and likewise in the prominent part taken in Section I by Professor Dr. Florovsky of the Russian Orthodox Church, formerly of the Paris Academy and now of St. Vladimir's Seminary and Academy, New York.

The negative character of much of Protestantism and its excessive individualism was replaced at Amsterdam by a vivid and effective new emphasis upon the common testimony on which all types of Protestants can stand; and the centuries-long isolation of the East has begun to yield to a warm friendly attitude increasingly manifested by the heirs of both major traditions.

But, it may be asked, what part of American Church life was really involved in what happened at Amsterdam? To answer, one needs certain facts which are little realized. There are listed in America over 230 denominations. Every European division is reflected here where the population has come from more than thirty nations; and Americans have been as inventive when it comes to Church policy and creed as they have been in other ways. Yet only 2 per cent of American Christians compose 200 of its various denominations. About 90 per cent are in only 20; 80 per cent are in 13. All but three of these are constituent to the World Council and were represented at Amsterdam. Put in another way, the fact is that four out of five American Protestants belong to one of the six great confessions; Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, Anglican, Presbyterian (or reformed), and Congregational (including the Disciples)—named in the order of their numerical strength in the United States. All of these major bodies save two—the Southern Baptist and the Missouri Synod Lutheran—were at Amsterdam officially. Even these two had contact through unofficial visitors, and both have had an increasing part in the common ecumenical relief work organized by the Council.

The overcoming of denominational divisions is now a marked trend in world Christianity. The bodies constituent to Amsterdam now number about one hundred and fifty. They fall into about seven main confessional groupings or families. None of these main families has as yet come together in organic and confessional unity on a large scale. But so many mergers have taken place within them that it may be truthfully said of the present 150 Churches that thirty years ago they were divided into 180 denominations. A century and a half ago there were about 240 of them. Measured

in these terms, therefore, there is more ecumenical progress than most churchmen have realized.

But the movement—and its Assembly—cannot be looked upon as designed to promote or foster in any direct way the organic union of its constituent members. Such unions take place in increasing numbers. But the Council is, and will remain, a free fellowship. It comprises a unity which does not seek uniformity. It builds a fellowship frankly accepting diversity. Its unity does not depend upon any authority save that of the Great Head of the Church, the Lord Jesus Christ. It seeks no legal identity. It is not destined to become a super-Church. Those who expected complete organic unity as a result of Amsterdam—and there were some in America—were, of course, inevitably disappointed. But most see, as the Archbishop of Canterbury put it from the chair on the last great day of the Assembly, "new power from heaven on earth resides in this World Council"; As his predecessor, William Temple, put it, the Churches through the Council are developing an "instrument for the Spirit of Christ through which He may transform our world".

All this emphasis upon the pragmatic, the life-and-work aspect is not intended to obscure the fact that there was another and a very important aspect of what took place there. If the first fact of significance is the official launching of the World Council, then the second is that a great company of Christians from the ends of the earth, from enemy nations, from both sides of the "iron curtain", from the older and the younger Churches, from Orthodoxy and from the world of the Reformation, prayed, worshipped, and thought together. That they found great differences was to be expected. But what had not been expected by many was what Dr. Karl Barth discovered and described as the experience of "having all our differences within the circle of our agreements". This is particularly significant as a sincere testimony from one who could not have avoided the realization that for a very large sector of American Christian thought his own views are almost totally unacceptable. As one prominent American said, partly in jest and partly in dead earnest, to Dr. Barth after his scathing criticism, from his own theological view point, of the preparatory study volumes which formed the background of the Amsterdam discussions: "If I believed what you do about man's passive part in the realization of God's will on earth, I would go home at once". Another American Anglican, Bishop Angus Dun of Washington, prominent in Section I—dealing with the nature of the Church, the problem of the Church in the Churches—put the experience to which Dr. Barth referred in other words; "Whenever we state a disagreement we find new agreements within it". He adds:

"That is the shape of our ecumenical conversations by which we grow in mutual understanding and are led 'deeper into the mystery of God's life and of ours'."

The typical American Christian believes in a vague sort of way that Jesus would not have taught his disciples to pray, "Our Father . . . thy will be done on earth", if, on the one hand, it was to imply that God needed to be urged to do His own will, or if, on the other hand, there was no way by which man could learn to do His will in existential history! It seems to many Americans, as it did to Dr. Edwin E. Aubrey, President of Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa., that Europeans—even when not in agreement with Dr. Barth—"do not seem to understand that . . . co-operation in practical tasks can produce a basis for deeper understanding and build a comradeship within which honest theological argument can continue fruitfully. In consequence they look upon American schemes for co-operation between autonomous denominations as shallow pragmatism . . .".

From an American viewpoint, what were the solid common convictions revealed at Amsterdam? Let Dr. Aubrey, writing in the Autumn 1948 "Christendom" (p. 437) afford a representative answer: "That God is lord of history, transcending all human action and standing in judgment upon it . . . all look to His mercy as their hope in desperation . . . Jesus Christ was acknowledged to be the center of history and the clue to the meaning of the Bible taken as a whole . . . No one felt confident that human nature has the power to save itself . . . There is an eternal element in the Church of which its historical forms are acknowledged by all; and division was felt to be a scandal. Finally the Assembly was dominated by the conviction that the Kingdom of God is . . . already introduced by Jesus Christ but not yet realized in full. And despite differences as to the relation of the Kingdom to history, there was clear agreement that a burden is laid on Christians to work for its coming, even though they cannot by their own efforts actually bring it in".

One may set over against certain of Dr. Aubrey's conclusions some of those expressed by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr. He found at Amsterdam, in contrast to "the sharp differences of conviction on almost every question of theology and policy, a remarkable consensus on social issues". Churches which cannot agree "on what the true Church is, have a fairly common mind on what it should do. . . . The old contrast between American activism and Continental quietism has disappeared completely. The European Churches, awakened to their social responsibilities in the last tragic decade, have become considerably more radical than most American Churches".

Like most Americans, Dr. Niebuhr confesses to a profound sense of the already existing spiritual unity of vast numbers of Christians as movingly demonstrated on what to him, as to many others, was probably the high point of the Assembly experience; namely the Communion service arranged by the host Church on the second Sunday of the sessions. It seems not to have been realized that most of the delegates participated, including Lutherans and Anglicans, and that it represented not only an open Communion but Inter-Communion—since those ministering at the table came from half-a-dozen different confessions. Of it, Dr. Niebuhr says: "Many representatives of the liturgical churches felt that the special form of the service, involving the seating of the communicants (a total of more than 1,100) around a common table and the passing of the Communion cup from one communicant to another, was a more vivid reminder of the historic Last Supper and a more telling sacramental exposition of the words 'This do in remembrance of me' than any alternative service". From the point of view of the number of confessions, races, nations, and ecclesiastical traditions represented in the persons of the communicants, this was, without doubt, the most universally inclusive celebration of the central Christian sacrament ever held. It was utterly unforgettable. As one American High-Churchman said afterwards; "When I came out from that service, in which to my surprise I found myself able to take part, some things I had thought impossible seemed possible and some things I have thought essential seemed non-essential".

Most of what emerged from Amsterdam's seminars and discussions is transmitted to the Churches, not in the form of resolutions with the weight of a great consensus behind them, but as "findings" for such consideration as the Churches see fit to give them. It is perhaps not surprising that of all the more than 30,000 words summing up these findings, one sentence got more comment and caused more discussion in America than all the rest put together. It was this: "The Christian Churches should reject the ideologies of both communism and *laissez-faire* capitalism, and should seek to draw men away from the false assumption that these extremes are the only alternatives".

Anyone who reads the total report of which this sentence forms a part will discover that it should never have been written as a single sentence capable of being lifted out of context and presented as if it summarized adequately the views expressed. It was assumed to mean that both systems are under equal condemnation for the same reasons, whereas the report makes it completely plain that this is not the case. Since most who read that sentence do not know what the ideology of the long outdated *laissez-faire*

capitalism was, and therefore assume that the condemnation is upon enlightened controlled modern capitalism for the same reason that condemnation is upon the thing represented in contemporary Soviet policy and practice, they recoil in amazement and incredulity. Furthermore, they assume that the implied alternative to either capitalism or communism must be some form of State monopoly or collectivism which they see as leading straight on to totalitarianism and the elimination of all individual liberty.

It has been salutary, however, to have Americans, who enjoy the highest standard of living in the world and the most effective freedom of speech, thought, and action under controlled capitalism, realize that much of the rest of the world has seen a very different facet of capitalism, particularly in the Far East and Africa. For much American capitalism overseas has been uncontrolled—i.e. essentially *laissez-faire*.

This leads to a somewhat different result of the Amsterdam Assembly. It has to do with the emergence of the leaders of the younger Churches in full equality with their brethren from the older Churches of the West. Says Niebuhr: "One heard the witness of the so-called younger Churches, the representatives of Asia and Africa, and one realized that the great missionary movement, begun over a century ago, was beginning to bear fruit in the universalization of the Church in history as well as in idea".

Thoughtful American Christians cannot avoid the observation that since almost seven-eighths of the millions of persons who belong to the younger Churches have been won to Christ by missionaries from England and America, where capitalism and capitalists have provided the means for the support of the missionary enterprise, it is at least necessary for those who would condemn all capitalism to admit that it has brought good gifts as well as evil! Without the contributions of capitalism in this particular form there would be neither an ecumenical movement nor an emerging world Christian community. Thus does the curious involvement of both good and evil in any human system become patent to view.

No reading of the Message of Amsterdam, and no observation concerning the impressions left by the Assembly, can be complete without reference to the recognition of a truly new experience of unity in personal loyalty to a living Lord rather than an intellectual, ecclesiastical, theological or philosophical oneness. The reason the delegates came together in the first place was because of their allegiance to Christ. Instinctively they knew already that they belonged together, that they had Him in common whatever else they might lack. They declared: "We are one in acknowledging Him as our God and Saviour . . . Christ has made us His own and He is not divided. In seeking Him we find one another . . .

We have committed ourselves afresh to Him, and have covenanted with one another in constituting this World Council of Churches. We intend to stay together". Of all the words spoken by the Assembly to "all who are in Christ, and to all who are willing to hear" these will be longer remembered than any others.

An American news reporter said that this was "merely diplomacy and contrivance". If so, it is on a higher level than history has yet recorded for any group of men and women drawn from the ends of the earth. All those who comprehend what took place feel impelled to say: "This is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes!" For they know that other world gatherings have made studies similar to those made at Amsterdam. Others have uttered collective judgments and examined aspects of truth as it is revealed differently to differing theologians. But no other world gathering of Christians, under no compulsion save the power of the Holy Spirit, and under no centralized human direction claiming to speak in His name, has entered into such a solemn compact of family unity around their "Elder Brother". In all the worship, fellowship, hard, honest debates and discussions, as well as in comprehensive planning and policy-making, the Spirit of Christ was felt as a unifying power. He alone could produce that intangible but priceless boon in a divided and doom-threatened atomic era—the sense of community. Amsterdam demonstrated the Christian awareness that an atomized Church is a menace in the atomic age and that only one which is able to manifest its own inner cohesion can hope to help hold the world together.

It was through the consciousness of common purpose rooted in a common personal loyalty that these Christians found a unity which cannot yet be expressed in any complete earthly manifestation of UNA SANCTA—One Holy, Catholic Church. Its real character can only be understood when one takes into consideration the qualities in human relationships which make for a truly united human family. The primary requirements are: concern for others and the eager search for contacts with them as members of a common household; the willingness to make concessions to others of their right to differ; the will to conciliate those who are in any kind of need—intellectual, spiritual or physical. All such attitudes —and they are incarnated and exemplified in the activities which the Churches have already carried on for ten years through the World Council in its tentative and incomplete form—lead to consolidation with others for the common good.

JOHN HICKS, MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL

By Alan Gibson, B.A.

The legend that the English Puritans of the seventeenth century were all dry, colourless men, though assiduously fostered by traditional prejudice, is of course false. A study of Milton's poetry and a glance at the "Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson" are enough to set at rest any doubts on this point. But many of the lesser pioneers of Dissent were equally lively and vigorous men: none more so than the Rev. John Hicks, minister (among other places) at Kingsbridge, in South Devon, whose vivacious character and hectic life scarcely harmonized with the atmosphere of so peaceful a country town.

John Hicks was a Yorkshireman by birth—at Moorhouse, Kirklywick, in 1633. He came to Devon in his early twenties, when Cromwell preferred him to the living of Stoke Damarel. At the Restoration he had to go, as the living was in the gift of the Crown, and crossed the Tamar to Saltash. In 1662 he was turned out of his church for a second time, by the Act of Uniformity, and went to Kingsbridge, where he started an illegal meeting of the Independents. Naturally he was soon in trouble with the Bishop's Court, and like many other Dissenting ministers, even in then remote Devon, was forced to go into hiding. He played hide and seek with his oppressors for the next ten years or so, at the end of which time he published a pamphlet setting out the story. In the manner of seventeenth century pamphlets, the title was virtually a contents-notice, and tells its own tale:

> "A True and Faithful Narrative, of the Unjust and Illegal Sufferings, and Oppressions of many Christians (Injuriously and Injudiciously called FANATICKS, holding all the Fundamentals of the Christian Religion, Believing all the Articles of the Christian Faith; and whose Lives and Conversations are as Consonant, and Agreeable to the Laws of God as theirs that persecute them) under, and by several of his Majesty's Justices of Peace, and others, who are no officers, but Informers, in the county of Devon, since the Tenth of May, 1670, from a pretended Zeal, to put the Law against CONVENTICLES in Execution. AS ALSO, Of the most Malicious Prosecution of Nine Innocent Persons, to take away their Lives, under a False pretence of Murdering an Informer; And of the Tryals that were betwixt Matthew Hele, of Halwel, in the Parish of Pool, William Bastard, of Garston, in the Parish of West Alvington, Esquires, and Mr. Edmund Reynel, and John Bear (called by a Nick-name Cockey Bear) Two

> Informers for pretended Neglects, of putting the Act against Conventicles in Execution, and the hard Measure they met with from the Judge; with the Horrid Perjuries of Witnesses brought against them, at the Assizes held at Exon in the county of Devon, April 1671".

Dissent was strong in Devon at this time, and the authorities were forced to rely considerably on informers to enforce the various enactments of the Clarendon Code, As can be seen from the title of the pamphlet, not all the local J.Ps. were active in maintaining the law, and Matthew Hele and William Bastard (a member of a family that had been in Devon since the Norman Conquest) got into trouble for their generous laxity. Justice Beare, of Bearscombe, won an unenviable local reputation for bitterness in administering the law, and one of his informers, named Lucas, several times put him on the track of Hicks.

On one occasion an apparitor was sent to the house where Hicks was known to be living, with a citation. When he knocked at the door, Hicks, who was a large man, with a formidable pair of shoulders, slowly descended the stairs to meet him, carrying a stout cudgel. The apparitor hesitantly muttered that he came to enquire for one Mr. Hicks, gentleman. John Hicks surveyed him carefully and answered in a deep voice: "I am John Hicks, Minister of the Gospel". There followed a considerable silence. Then the apparitor, possibly in response to a suggestive twitch of the cudgel, left without saying another word.

Of course, not all troubles were countered so easily, but by dint of a combination of discretion and valour Hicks contrived to minister to his congregation for some years. Sometimes he preached on the Saltstone Rock, an island in the Estuary: here he was unchallenged, since the jurisdiction of the Rock was disputed and no authority would accept responsibility for it. The Saltstone is only about a hundred feet long and fifty broad, but accessible from the shore at low water without too much inconvenience. The most famous of those who ministered there was not, however, John Hicks, but Flavell, the well-known Independent divine, of Dartmouth.

After various other brushes with the ecclesiastical and lay authorities, Hicks was arrested with eight others, as his pamphlet tells, on a charge of the murder of an informer. That the charge was trumped-up is evident by the fact of their acquittal at Exeter Assizes. The publication of his story persuaded the Bishop's Court to another attempt to bring him to heel. This time they sent two messengers to maintain one another's courage. Riding on the Exeter-Kingsbridge road, they met another horseman going in the same direction. He proved good company, and they lunched together. As they went, the apparitors confided to the

stranger the difficult business on which they were engaged, denouncing Hicks as a menace to all good government and decent living. The stranger listened calmly until the meal was over, and all three had repaired to the stable to fetch their horses. He then informed them that the object of their journey and their wrath was none other than himself, and set about them with his cane—"correcting them till they begged his pardon", as Calamy pleasantly puts its.

Invigorated by the exertion, but appreciating that such an action would not pass unrequited, Hicks then rode straight to London, where, after some little difficulty, he actually succeeded in obtaining an audience with Charles II. King Charles was not without redeeming qualities, and was characteristically interested in rather than angered at so unconventional a visitor. When Charles rebuked him for abusing his ministers and the justices of the peace, Hicks replied: "Oppression, may it please your Majesty, makes a wise man mad. The justices, beyond all law, have very much wronged your Majesty's loyal subjects, the Nonconformists in the west". He went on to substantiate his claim, and the King must have listened the more readily since he was disposed at the time to win the approval of the Dissenters and, by granting toleration to them, succeed in obtaining toleration also for his Roman Catholic co-religionists. The upshot of this policy was the short-lived Declaration of Indulgence in 1672. In Devon, Hicks not unnaturally claimed most of the credit. He was given a Royal pardon for his offences, and on the 6th April, 1672, presented to the King a Grateful Acknowledgment for Indulgence, signed by 72 West-country ministers. His prestige was high; but when the Indulgence ended his danger was the greater. The Bishop of Exeter spoke of "Mr. Hicks, famous or infamous rather in these parts, and bold at Court", who "is come down and disturbs the quiet and peace to the grief of good men. An honest Justice whom Mr. Hicks got turned out by my late Lord Chancellor for doing his duty I for the same reason got restored by my Lord Keeper". In the face of the increasing persecution Hicks moved to Portsmouth. After a little he was driven from there, and before long was at Keynsham, still preaching with great fervour and at considerable length, and still punctuating his existence with periodic brushes with the authorities and with his congregations.

It was only in his death that Hicks became a figure of more than local note. He fought with Monmouth. He claimed to believe that Monmouth was his true king, a belief shared by many Whigs, though not the more intelligent of them. In any case he was too fond of a fight to stay out of a cause that was so near his heart. So it came about that in the morning after the savage chaos of Sedgmoor, Hicks was flying for his life, accompanied by a lawyer

called Richard Nelthorpe, who had already been outlawed for plotting against the Government. Hicks was now fifty-two, which is no age for a desperate cross-country ride; and he was exhausted when, after a day of inadequate refuges and narrow escapes, he came with Nelthorpe to Batcombe Grange, Somerset, the home of Lady Alice Lisle.

Lady Alice was the widow of John Lisle, one of the ablest in the company of able men that had surrounded Cromwell when he was Lord Protector. Macaulay, who has told the story unforgettably, declares that in the Civil Wars Lady Alice had often befriended Royalists in a similar plight to that of Nelthorpe and Hicks. Since the Restoration she had lived quietly in her country houses, esteemed by friend and foe alike. She readily enough helped the two latest fugitives. At her trial she declared that she had not known they were men of Monmouth's army, but had mistaken Hicks for a persecuted minister, with warrants out against him for field-preaching; which seems possible, though no more. The penalty for helping such a man was of course less severe than for succouring a traitor, and technically all Monmouth's forces were traitors. Possibly Hicks deliberately masqueraded as nothing more than a minister threatened with a writ from a justice of the peace; but in that case his exhausted condition would seem a little unaccountable. However that may be, he and Nelthorpe had a night's rest, and were roused in the morning with the news that the King's troops were surrounding the house and about to search it.

Hicks hid in the malt-house; Nelthorpe in the chimney. They were both dragged out and taken prisoner. The Royalist commander, Colonel Penruddock, arrested Lady Alice as well. He was of the same family as the Penruddock who had led an abortive rising against Cromwell in the West country thirty years earlier, some of whose soldiers may have found a haven at Batcombe Grange. But Penruddock can scarcely have guessed what the consequences of his action would be.

Lady Alice was tried before Jeffreys. If she had indeed sheltered traitors, knowing them to be traitors, she was guilty of a capital crime, though in such circumstances it was inconceivable that the penalty should be enforced. But in fact she was tried before Hicks and Nelthorpe had been tried, and consequently could not legally be found guilty. (This was pointed out in the Act of Parliament reversing her attainder, passed when William III came to the throne). It took all the cursing and bullying of which Jeffreys was capable to obtain a verdict of guilty from the jury. When Lady Alice protested that she did not know the refugees were traitors, Jeffreys made the famous reply: "But I will tell

you. There is not one of those lying, snivelling, canting Presbyterians but, one way or another, had a hand in the rebellion. Presbytery has all manner of villainy in it. Nothing but Presbytery could have made Dunne (one of the witnesses) such a rogue. Show me a Presbyterian; and I'll show thee a lying knave". The savage partiality and unscrupulous inaccuracy of this indictment were characteristic of the methods of the infamous judge.

When the jury reluctantly gave their verdict, Jeffreys pronounced that Lady Alice should be burned alive the same afternoon. A strong remonstrance from the clergy of Winchester Cathedral induced Jeffreys to modify the sentence. He put it off five days, and commuted it to beheading. Further than that he would not go, in spite of constant supplication from numbers of influential folk, including Feversham, the King's General at Sedgmoor, and Clarendon, the King's brother-in-law.

Hicks and Nelthorpe were two more of the three hundred and twenty rebels hanged on the western circuit of Jeffreys' Bloody Assize. For John Hicks it was a stormy end to a stormy life. Men of his indomitable determination were the heart and soul of the early Free Churches. He is still remembered at Kingsbridge, where the key of his Chapel is in the possession of the Baptist Church (holding it in trust for the Congregational Church, which was destroyed by a bomb in the war and has at present no separate existence). A picture of his arrest, painted by Ward, is in the Houses of Parliament. A novel, now forgotten and virtually unobtainable, called "Troublous Times" (by Jane Bowring Cranch, of Kingsbridge) embodies some of his adventures in autobiographical form. Otherwise he has no memorial. His body was one of those left to rot away in the market-places of West country towns by Jeffreys, as a gruesome testimony to the power of a beneficent Government. But his work did not rot away, and the lively condition of the Dissenting witness in Kingsbridge, and Totnes, and a number of other places in the South Hams of Devon, from the seventeenth century onwards, owes much to him.

"CLEANSING AFFECTION FROM THE TEMPORAL"

SOME NOTES ON *BURNT NORTON* BY T. S. ELIOT

By L. Alun Page, B.A.

The *Four Quartets* of T. S. Eliot are without doubt an adult expression of the explorations of one of the most incisive and profound minds of our time. Indeed, in comparison with many of his contemporaries, one is struck by both the breadth and the narrowness of the poet. He does not hesitate to struggle with problems which in their very nature have a vast and cosmic sweep: the problems of man's whole destiny, his relation to the tremendous rhythm of Nature; the significant relationship of the individual to the past and the mystery of the varied powers operative in history—the debt one owes to the clan, nation or race. And then the inner recesses of the human spirit; its degradations and potentialities, its pettinesses and paradoxes. Within the scope of these poems comes the tense consideration of man's relationship to the temporal and the eternal. Indeed, the form or matrix of all these various explorations is an essay in the problem of Time. They are an effort to comprehend reality in the lighted moment when the timeless and the temporal infuse each other. The poems are speculation—great speculation—but shot through with the exquisite sensitivity of a master of words and imagery. The poet's vision is wide enough in its sweep to be racial and universal and yet its universality is most truly seen in its intense relevance to *individual* experience. What he says is wide enough to take in the whole current of history and yet narrow enough to enter the gates of the soul.

Burnt Norton, the first of the poems, is in some senses the most difficult. It has an abstractedness which at first reading tends to be taxing. Here the poet affirms the basic ideas and searchings which stimulate his vision. There is a great amount of abstract statement which stands bare and austere, with the clean lines of a mathematical proposition. The other poems are in a sense a series of concrete elaborations on themes which are approached here. It is as if the striving of the poet after ultimate meanings had seared away everything but the basic, compressed actualities on which his vision rests. *Burnt Norton* is a direct, intense meditation on the themes of the two epigraphs with which the poems are prefaced, from the *Fragments* of the Greek philosopher Heracleitus. The first is translated, "The law of things is a law of Reason Universal, but most

men live as though they had a wisdom of their own", and the second, "The way up and the way down is one and the same".

The poet is in the garden of a Gloucestershire country house (there is no further significance in the poem's title), and it seems that besides suggesting much of the imagery of the poem there is an echo on a profounder level of the first Garden. The Genesis story conveys that man was cast out and therefore involved in the intricacies of partial and insensitive experience. That is the tragedy: man is too involved with the passing show and further limits himself. Eliot, however, tries with poetic insight to view the time process imaginatively and objectively. He tries to get outside time and know that man is not completely involved on only one plane. The timeless bisects the arc of the time process and gives it validity.

> What might have been and what has been
> Point to one end, which is always present.
> Footfalls echo in the memory
> Down the passage which we did not take
> Towards the door we never opened
> Into the rose-garden.

There is an end which is eternally present but located outside history. The power of the Myth conveys awareness of that which transcends time. There can be more truth in myth than in mere unrelated facts. The complex and often irrelevant maze of trivial facts blinds us very often to the great truth that can only be known by the imagination.

The reference to the rose-garden is suggestive. Quite certainly, the rose carries with it the typical sexual and religious associations. An 'echo in the memory' haunts human kind in the same sense as the Reason Universal of Heracleitus convinces us that our partial wisdoms are a departure from reality.

Eliot makes use of other telling images to bring home the poignant sense of something beautifully haunting and inexplicably lost. We hear of hidden music and the elusive voice of a bird. The poet is straining to convey an almost lost sense of reality. [1]There is dust and dryness, the dryness of concrete—an appropriate modern image—but in the moment of vision comes the divine sunlight which illuminates reality, if only momentarily, because human kind cannot sustain much of the pure level of being. The experience is fleeting but the conviction is made explicit that we are not tied hand and foot to the time process on only one plane—there is always the end, the objective outside time. It abides whether or not it is seen. The poet is looking for a technique of humility, a vital passivity

1 One thinks of the Eliot of *The Waste Land*. But here, as Raymond Preston observes, he is on the edge of faith. Sunlight and water appears, but *cf. The Waste Land* line 331 foll. "Here there is no water but only rock/Rock and no water and the sandy road/The road winding above among the mountains/Which are mountains of rock without water".

which will lift him from the common-place level to a fuller spiritual dimension. In the passage in question he uses references to the voices of unseen children (except ye become as a little child?); the unheard music; the pool filled with water and the crying bird. He creates an exquisite sense of a world lost and yet sighted again in a moment of vision.

> Quick, said the bird, find them, find them,
> Round the corner. Through the first gate,
> Into our first world, shall we follow
> The deception of the thrush? . . .
> And the bird called in response to
> The unheard music hidden in the shrubbery,
> And the unseen eyebeam crossed, for the roses
> Had the look of flowers that are looked at . . .
> Dry the pool, dry concrete, brown edged,
> And the pool was filled with water out of sunlight,
> And the lotus rose, quietly, quietly,
> The surface glittered out of heart of light . . .
> Go, go, go said the bird: human kind
> Cannot bear very much reality.
> Time past and time future
> What might have been and what has been
> Point to one end, which is always present.

Human kind hidden in the petty and ephemeral, is tragically unable to bear for long the scintillating light of the vision. "Go, go, go said the bird" and in its command sounds the pathos of the human situation. Man has lost his vision of the real, but in the sun-lit moment the poet reaffirms the End, outside ourselves and therefore outside history.

The second movement of the poem—the similarity to the musical form of the quartet is deliberate, allowing unity in diversity, varied meditation on a central theme—is introduced by a short passage with some startling images. It is probable that Eliot here confesses his affinity with the French Symbolists. The point of the variety of symbols is clear, to emphasize the underlying unity of created things. The human and the stolidly material, the small and the great, testify to a mysterious unity: the construction of the atom a microcosm of the solar system. In their configurations all things declare a profound coherence. From mud to stars there is a linking movement, a dance, a divine rhythm.

> Garlic and sapphires in the mud
> Clot the bedded axle tree . . .
> The dance along the artery
> The circulation of the lymph
> Are figured in the drift of stars . . .
> Below the boarhound and the boar
> Pursue their pattern as before
> But reconciled among the stars.

The poet is deeply concerned with the technique of apprehending the ultimate reality, and the way he follows is the way of *negation*. The concepts employed are those of the mystic and the saint; a conquest of the ephemeral by stripping away the masks of time; an attempt to realize with the force of the imagination the discipline of contemplation. It is a way little known to the bustling twentieth century but it is the only way of purification. The poet does not seek feverishly to hide himself from reality by still more bustle and shouting. He will be quiet and know in the stillness that which words cannot ordinarily enunciate.

At the still point of the turning world. Neither flesh nor fleshless;
Neither from nor towards; at the still point, there the dance is,
But neither arrest nor movement. And do not call it fixity.
Where past and future are gathered . . .
The inner freedom from the practical desire
The release from action and suffering, release from the inner
And the outer compulsion, yet surrounded
By a grace of sense, a white light still and moving.

Reality is more than logical statement will ever be. In the deeper reaches of human experience we must always have resort to paradox—except we lose our life we shall not find it—and here the poet holds in tension the concept of stillness and the dance. Both are of the essence of the pattern. The 'grace of sense' is a 'white light *still* and *moving*'.

Next comes an abrupt and cruelly revealing picture of a place of 'disaffection'. It is the world we know today, the world of the daily headlines, the cheap emotions of the mass mind. Turning from the description of his agonizing approach to reality Eliot delineates the features of mankind buried in the transitory and the trivial.

Here is a place of disaffection
Time before and time after
In a dim light . . .
Only a flicker
Over the strained time ridden faces
Distracted from distraction by distraction
Filled with fancies and empty of meaning . . .
Men and bits of paper, whirled by the cold wind
That blows before and after time,
Wind in and out of unwholesome lungs
Time before and time after.
Eructation of unhealthy souls
Into the faded air, the torpid
Driven on the wind that sweeps the gloomy hills of London,
Hampstead and Clerkenwell, Camden and Putney,
Highgate, Primrose and Ludgate. Not here
Not here the darkness in this twittering world.

We can alter the place names to suit ourselves, but the indictment stands to expose our modern condition. In the masterly last phrase Eliot sums it all up: the world is spiritually bankrupt because it is *trivial*. The darkness is, of course, the way of contemplation, 'the dark night of the soul' of St. John of the Cross, the Spanish poet and mystic.

Mankind is in willing bondage to the trivial. It is not that the poet scoffs at the trivial for being the machinery of ordinary human intercourse, but the insignificant should command its place only in the perspective of the truly significant. During these years of restlessness men have tended to overemphasize their concern for the merely ordinary. A favourite theme of war propaganda was that a man should fight for the right to till his own back garden and to be content with the ordinary, intimate details that go to make up daily life for the masses—for the miner, shop assistant, farm worker, carpenter, cook, teacher, and so on; all who occupy their neat little niche in the scheme of things. But the trivialities of common sense do not avail for building a new mind and a new soul for mankind. Something more profound and more powerful is needed. Modern man is a quite good mechanic: he knows well how to tinker with and patch up a machine that is running down, but the most progressive and sensitive contemporary observers recognize now that his machine mentality is ridiculously out of date. Man needs to be more than an enlightened engineer to solve the problems of our time, he needs the insight and sensitivity of the prophet. The contemporary front is crumbling away for lack of an adequate spiritual cement. Eliot is arguing for the relevance of a type of experience that humanity has denied all too long, in bare abstract language that condenses the travail of his thought. Political man has tub-thumped; economic man has brandished his statistics; sociological man has made his surveys—there remains the saint, who by his denial of the importance of the trivial as such can point through negation to fulness and ultimate significance. Through the dark night of the soul, by the technique of denial (not for its own sake alone) the saint 'descends into the world of perpetual solitude . . . deprivation and destitution of property'.

In the last movement of the poem we have a glimpse of what this inward struggle must cost the poet.

> Words strain
> Crack and sometimes break, under the burden,
> Under tension, slip, slide, perish,
> Decay with imprecision, will not stay in place,
> Will not stay still.

The words which come to mind naturally in writing of *Burnt Norton* convey the sense of taut, leashed power. One has to talk of 'tension' and 'intensity' in order to describe the impact of this

supercharged writing. The thought is stark, without frills of any description. One feels that it distils, as it were, the essential Eliotness of Eliot's poetry. The poem makes demands on the reader intellectually and emotionally, but once its formal ideas and underlying insights are known the other poems light up with a fine illumination.

Burnt Norton states the theme of *Four Quartets* bluntly and baldly, while the other three poems develop it less austerely and with reference to a specific background. *East Coker* deals with the poet's reactions to his human, ancestral affinities—East Coker was the Somerset village from which his ancestors went forth to the New World; the *Dry Salvages* sees man in his elemental relationship to his cosmic environment, to the universe of material things; and *Little Gidding* returns with beautiful discrimination to the life of the individual and his faith.

A HYMN FOR A COUNTRY IN RUINS

By Friedrich von Logau

[Friedrich von Logau is a name known to few readers of German; with his "Gottes Mühlen mahlen langsam" (Though the mills of God grind slowly) we have only grown familiar owing to Longfellow's translation. Yet his dates, 1605-1655, cover the whole period of the Thirty Years War, when Germany was devastated, and became a prey to pest, famine, wild beasts and the sword, as never before in her history. It is not without significance that one who described as scarcely any other writer has done the horrors of those days, should be remembered in the Germany of today. On Friday, 24th December last, the leading page of the Christmas number of "Welt am Sonntag" was taken up by a large picture of ruined buildings and by the only poem of Logau bearing any resemblance to a hymn. These verses were first printed in Rörer's "Hymns for Church and Home" (Vollständige Kirchen und Hausmusik, p. 650), published in Breslau in 1644. The following is a rough translation, in which Logau's rhyme-scheme and rhythm have been closely followed.]

God, Thou great friend of every separate nation,
The only hope of sinful man's salvation,
Look down upon us, robbed of life's best guerdon
By many a burden.

Through long sad years, with fearful footsteps hastening,
We felt the sting of Thy stern rod of chastening;
By day and night Thy hand fresh grief exacted
From us, distracted.

War devastating the fair land we cherished!
All we most loved in life consumed and perished!
Struck down by plague, loved comrades without number
The grave-yards cumber.

Through famine sore how many have passed from us!
And we who're left find slowly creeping on us
Sharp-fanged serpents lusting to o'erpower us,
Keen to devour us.

Master, what strange aspect to us Thou turnest,
As though with harsh austerity Thou burnest!
Where then have gone Thy pity so paternal,
Thy love eternal?

We must perforce endure Thy castigation
For the base crimes that sully our whole nation.
But we repent and come—just vengeance braving—
Thy pardon craving.

Turn Thou then to us now in great compassion;
This woe, this havoc, cure in Thine own fashion.
As erst, be Thou our God, Thyself revealing
To work our healing.

Those who Thy Church on earth now rule, try ever
To grasp dominion—this, their one endeavour.
Those who make Thee their sole loved Shepherd, Pastor,
They seek to master.

Seize then Thine own domain, Thou Who hast bought us.
Preserve unhurt the truths Thy lips once taught us.
Let no restraint nor force nor suffering sever
Us from Thee ever.

Only, Lord, walk with us through all life's hours.
Help in the fight against Thy foes and ours,
Who only scheme and plot to wipe out wholly
Thy Word all holy.

Patient we'll bear Thy justly-earned chastising
For having wrought so ill, Thy Law despising,
If but this strife with men so contradictory
End in Thy victory.

(*Translated by Sydney H. Moore*)

THE MANIFEST SPLENDOUR OF GOD

A Study of Biblical Thought on the Media of Revelation[1]

By H. H. Rowley, D.D., D.Theol., F.B.A.

"No man hath seen God at any time" and none therefore has beheld His splendour in all its glory. To an Isaiah some vision of that splendour was given, and its effect was to fill him with trembling awe and the consciousness of his sinfulness. But Isaiah's vision did not exhaust the glory of God, which could not be revealed to eye alone or be wholly comprehended by man. My purpose therefore is not to try to describe the indescribable, or to exhaust the inexhaustible. Nor do I wish to offer a theological study of the Being of God in terms of polysyllabic abstractions. I wish rather to study some of the ways in which the splendour of God is mediated to us.

From the beginning of Time man has sought God, and God has sought man. "Canst thou by searching find out God?" asked Zophar, and while the answer is clearly "No," it is wholly right that man should seek Him diligently. It would be foolish for man to presume that by his own skill and resource he could uncover a God Who sought to conceal Himself from him; but it is supreme wisdom to seek a God Who delights to reveal Himself to men, and Who can only reveal Himself in the measure of their sensitiveness to His revelation. In all sound education there is active co-operation by both teacher and taught, and for the apprehension of the Divine revelation, given as it is of the initiative of God and as the evidence of His grace, there is needed the eager activity of the seeking and receptive spirit. Yet most of what I have to say will concern the divine side of this process, God's unveiling of His splendour to men who will perceive it. That unveling has taken many forms, and while its climax is the revelation of which we have records in the Bible, and supremely the revelation in Christ, it is not confined to this. The only God of all men has revealed Himself to men of every race, and the uniqueness of His revelation to Israel is not the uniqueness of the fact of revelation, or primarily the uniqueness of the form of the revelation, but the uniqueness of the measure of the revelation.

I

That God has revealed Himself in Nature is declared in the Bible, and would be denied by few. "The heavens declare the glory of God." In the wonders of the universe His splendour is

[1] The C. J. Cadoux Memorial Lecture, delivered at Yorkshire United College, Bradford, on 8th March, 1949.

seen. "Lift up your eyes on high, and see who hath created these, that bringeth out their host by number." In all the regular processes of Nature on which man's life and well-being depend, the hand of the Creator is seen. There have been religions primarily or wholly Nature religions, rising no higher than this, and worshipping only the God Who is revealed in Nature. Canaanite Baalism was of such a character, and its ritual and its festivals were designed to maintain the springs of fertility in family, field and flock. Like all Nature religions it had no high moral quality, for Nature alone cannot carry us far into the character and will of God. Nevertheless men everywhere have believed that God could use Nature to make His will known. In the withholding of the gifts of Nature His displeasure has been seen, and in the more terrifying and destructive forces of Nature which are sometimes released upon men, they have been summoned to self-examination through the belief that they must have offended Him. Israel was not without this belief. When drought afflicted the land in the time of David, it was believed that sin must be its cause, and the sin was traced to Saul's slaughter of Gibeonites many years before. Similarly the plague that carried off numbers of people in the same reign was believed to be due to divine offence at David's census. Moreover the prophets declared that a break in the ordered sequence of Nature might be a divine summons to repentance. "I have withholden the rain from you, when there were yet three months to the harvest . . . yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord." Yet the religion of the Old Testament could never be described as a Nature religion, in the sense that the powers of Nature were worshipped and the processes of Nature were held to reveal the essential Being of God. If He used the forces of Nature to effect His purpose or to reveal His will, they were but instruments in His hand and not God Himself.

II

Among many peoples men have thought that they could discover the will or purpose of God by mechanical means, and that if they provided the appropriate channel He could be relied on to approach them by it. Here we find ourselves in the world of magic, where reliance is put on human technique to control God. Given acts have only to be performed in the right way, or by the right persons, and interpreted by skilled technicians, to ensure well-being for man and to extract from God what man wants to know. By hepatoscopy the liver of a slaughtered animal had but to be studied by one skilled to understand its meaning, and the future could be divined. In disease one had but to go to the priest who knew the proper incantation to get relief. This type of belief and practice was far more characteristic of Israel's

neighbours than of the religion of the Old Testament. It will be observed that I am careful to say the religion of the Old Testament, and not the religion of Israel. For the Old Testament itself informs us that through long periods such practices were not unknown in Israel. The prophets would not have denounced diviners and mediums if there had been none in their day. Yet divination stands under such clear condemnation in the Old Testament that it cannot be regarded as a characteristic medium of revelation in the essential thought of the Bible. Similarly men supposed that their well-being could be secured by correct ritual performance without reference to any other consideration. Yet again, they stand under such sharp condemnation in the prophetic teaching that they cannot be regarded as representatives of Biblical religion.

On the other hand we cannot ignore such evidences of this kind of outlook as are found without condemnation in the Old Testament. Joseph, who is presented as a man of exalted character and piety, whose loyalty to God was above reproach and with whom the Lord was in adversity and in prosperity, is said to have had his divining cup. Moreover, the Urim and Thummim provided a mechanical way of finding the will of God, and are nowhere condemned in the Bible. How this sacred lot was worked we cannot know with certainty, but it seems to have been capable of giving one of two answers to any question put to it, or of refusing to give an answer. One view is that there were two stones, of which one was the Urim stone and the other the Thummim stone, and that when the receptacle in which they were placed was shaken, the answer could be known according to which of them flew out, while if both flew out there was no answer. Another view, which seems to me more probable, is that the two stones had flat sides, of which one was the auspicious side and the other the inauspicious. If the stones flew out and fell showing the same side the answer was Urim or Thummim according to which side it was, while if they displayed different sides no answer was given. However that might be, there can be no doubt that the sacred lot provided a mechanical means of finding the will or purpose of God, though it could not claim to compel an answer, since it provided for the case when no answer was vouchsafed.

Here, as always, it is important that we should approach the Old Testament with a historical sense, and should view it dynamically. By this I mean that we should consider its processes and not alone its moments. We should not read back into all the Old Testament its highest teaching, and still less should we read back into it the teaching of the New Testament. On the other hand we should not read forward into it all the primitive background of which we have so much fuller knowledge today than we had even a few years ago. We should rather find great variety

of levels in its vast panorama, stretching over more than a thousand years, and should not be surprised to find development over that period. The development was not all in a straight line, and it should never be supposed that the mere passage of time by itself issues in higher and better faith and practice. Nevertheless when we view the process in the large we do see some growth. And the essential character of Old Testament religion is to be seen in the direction in which there was growth. In my view, which I have repeatedly expressed, the seeds of the growth are to be found quite early, and in the work of Moses there were incipient ideas and principles which became more clearly formulated later. It is because of that that I do not speak merely of the religion of Moses and the religion of the Prophets but of the religion of the Old Testament. Underlying all its development there was an essential unity, because it was the living growth of something whose seed was there from the beginning, or at least from the time of Moses. Behind it were primitive ideas received from the stock out of which Israel came and shared with the peoples who formed her milieu. These ideas are not characteristic of the religion of the Old Testament but belong to a wider setting. From some of them Israel became gradually freed under the influence of her own religious leaders. The religion of the Old Testament is not to be expressed in terms of these pre-Israelite beliefs and practices which were gradually shed. We are all painfully conscious that slavery long flourished amongst Christian nations, and that even one of our best known hymn writers could engage in the slave trade. Yet we maintain that slavery stands under the condemnation of the Gospel, and the true character of the Christian faith is to be seen in the abolition of slavery and not in its long toleration. In the same way the true character of Old Testament religion is to be seen in the shedding of certain ideas and practices and not in their being carried forward from an ancient heritage and a persistent environment for a long time. Divination and mechanical means of learning the will of God were either condemned or fell into disuse precisely because they were not characteristic of the religion of the Old Testament, but were survivals of an older practice. It is true that Urim and Thummim were never discarded or condemned. Yet they fell into disuse, and it is only in the earlier period of the history that we read of their employment. Though they survived, it was to be merely a part of the priestly insignia, a mere fossil and not a living instrument of religious practice.

It is the same with the Psalms. The distinguished Norwegian scholar Mowinckel a quarter of a century ago propounded some views on the Psalms which will long continue to influence all study

of the Psalter, whether they are accepted or not. Amongst them is the view that many of the psalms were intended to be used to break spells which people supposed to have been put on them. He held that the psalms were intended for ritual, and not merely liturgical, use. That is to say, they were held to be integral parts of ritual acts which were not complete without them, and the purpose of the acts may be discovered from the study of the psalms. Wherever we find the phrase "workers of iniquity" in the psalms Mowinckel thought we should discern a reference to the makers of spells, and whoever recited the psalms, or on whose behalf they were recited, desired to be freed from the spell. Mowinckel complains that I have done him some injustice in speaking of this as a magical use of the psalms, since his view is that these psalms were not regarded as counter-spells, able by their mere recitation to break the spells, but prayers to God to break them by the exercise of His grace. I should be sorry to do any injustice to one I esteem so highly, though on this view the psalms would still remain ritual texts for people who believed in the power of magic, and directly associated with magical ideas. Of this I am not convinced, though I go a long way with Mowinckel.

Behind the Old Testament psalms there lies a long history of psalmody. There are Babylonian psalms which were often linked with magical use, since in the Babylonian priesthood there were classes of priests assigned to various divinatory and other magical practices. Between the Babylonian and the Hebrew psalms there are innumerable links of phrase. Moreover, the Ras Shamra texts have now provided further links of phrase and a whole collection of parallels. The Biblical psalms can no longer be studied in isolation, but only in the background of ancient Oriental psalmody, and that magical ideas prevailed in that background can scarcely be disputed. We know too little of the age of the Biblical psalms to speak with any confidence of the time when they were written. It is certain, however, that they were collected into the present Psalter in the post-exilic period. It is improbable that the psalms that were written in post-exilic days are to be interpreted in terms of Babylonian magical psalms, or that psalms that were collected in post-exilic days were intended to be used for the breaking of spells. Whether any of them were once used for such a purpose cannot be proved, though I would agree that it is likely that there was a time when such psalms were used in Israel. For Canaanite and Assyrian influence in pre-exilic religion is amply attested in the Old Testament itself. The links of phrase do not prove community of purpose and use with Babylonian psalms, since forms of expression tend to persist, even when filled with a new meaning and spirit. Hence while I would agree that lying behind the

Psalter is a history in which magical ideas had a place, I do not think the Psalms should be interpreted in relation to that history but rather in relation to the post-exilic religion they were collected, and probably in large part written, to serve. There is a quality about the Biblical psalms that differentiates them from the Babylonian, and that no verbal parallels can disguise, and it is by that differential quality that the Biblical psalms are primarily to be judged.

Similarly with the magical view of sacrifice. There were people in Israel who supposed that by the abundance of their sacrifices, performed with the correct ritual, they could ensure the favour of God irrespective of the lives they led. Such an idea was not confined to Israel; but in Israel it met unequivocal condemnation in the prophets. So sharp is the condemnation, indeed, that many have supposed that the prophets held that sacrifice was wholly and essentially evil, and under all circumstances unacceptable to God. It was here that I found myself in disagreement with the friend whose memory we keep in this lecture. Such a view rested on the exaggerated antithesis of law and prophets, or of priests and prophets, and on the failure to recognize a fundamental unity in the Old Testament underlying all its diversity. That there is a difference of emphasis is beyond question; but that there is a fundamental cleavage I cannot agree. The creators of Judaism, who built of the materials of ancient practice the edifice of the sacrificial ritual that prevailed down to New Testament times, were not indifferent to the lives that men lived or the spirit in which they offered their sacrifice. They would not have gathered the prophetic books that denounced sacrifices if they had understood them to refer to all sacrifices, or even that denounced hollow sacrifices if they had believed that no sacrifices could be hollow. Nor would they have gathered the Psalter, with its prevailingly high spiritual quality, if they had been indifferent to anything but ritual. That many individuals in post-exilic days fell below the spiritual level of the creators of Judaism is doubtless true. But Judaism is not to be judged by them, but by the essential quality which its creators gave it and desired it to preserve—and which it did indeed preserve to be the heritage of our Lord and of the Church. The pre-exilic prophets, who looked on a society that flouted the will of God in its life and offered a ritual worship whose plea was rejected by that life, declared that sacrifices and prayers and other religious observances were meaningless when they were not the organ of the spirit's approach to God. The creators of post-exilic Judaism, who ordered the ritual with such care, desired it to be the organ of men's approach to God, and made it clear that it could not be effective for those who refused to validate it by their spirit.

From all this it would appear that, despite a background of other ideas and some survivals in the Old Testament at some levels, it is not of the essence of the Old Testament thought to suppose that God can be controlled by technical and mechanical means or forced to reveal His will and purpose to men by mere human skill.

III

That God reveals Himself to men through their experience, either individual or collective, is a belief which appears again and again in the Old Testament, and which once more is not confined to Israel. Here the initiative comes from God, and not from a human technique, though outside the Bible we find an effort to reduce this to a technique, and it may well be that in Israel there were some who did the same. Every student of the prophets is familiar with such examples as Jeremiah's seeing an almond tree in blossom and finding his thought carried from the name of the tree, *shaked*, to the word *shoked*, and so to God's message to him; or the same prophet's seeing a seller of figs with two baskets of widely different quality and being prompted by the sight to a message for his time; or Amos's seeing a basket of summer fruit, and finding his thought carried from the word for summer fruit, *kais*, to the word *kes*, end, and so to a message for men. In every such case, the prophet was convinced that it was not by the activity of his own mind that his thought was carried from the thing he saw to a message which could in no sense be said to come of itself out of that thing. Professor Guillaume has given examples of the turning of this into a technique amongst the Arabs, so that a technician, when appealed to for light on some problem, finds in the first thing his eye catches the clue to his answer. It is possible that in Israel, when appeals were made to seers or prophets to answer such questions as Saul's about his father's lost asses, or that of Jeroboam's wife as to whether her child would recover, similar methods were used, though we are not told how the answer to the question was found. But all the examples that stand in the prophetic books are of some chance experience which becomes, by divine initiative, the occasion of a message.

So, too, dreams were believed to be a medium of divine revelation. We know that prophets sometimes received their messages in dreams, and we have such stories as that of Pharaoh's dreams, where divine activity is accepted, though the dreamer was unable to understand the message without an interpreter. Here again amongst other peoples the same belief has been found, and some have sought to convert this into a technique. Not all dreams can be supposed to be the channel of divine revelation,

but men have supposed that by resort to a sacred spot to sleep a significant dream might be obtained.

In a far deeper sense, experience became the medium of God's revelation of Himself to Hosea. Here it was no chance and fleeting experience, but one which brought intense and prolonged agony to his soul, that brought him a revelation of God to inspire his ministry. The unfaithfulness of the wife he so deeply loved, instead of souring and embittering his whole nature, became for him the window into the heart of God and gave a profundity to his message of the Divine love for Israel that is nowhere surpassed in the Old Testament.

On the wider scale of national experience, we continually find the thought that God is in control of history, and that history may be the vehicle of his message. The alteration of oppression and deliverance in Israel's history in the period of the Judges is set forth as due to divine activity. When Israel was disloyal to Him then trouble came upon her that she might become sensible of the error of her ways, and then a deliverer was raised up by God, who not alone gave her deliverance from her enemies but called her to fresh obedience to God. In the opening oracles in the book of Amos it is declared that it is not merely Israel's history that is of concern to God. Upon other people, too, He visits their sins.

Yet nowhere is it claimed that all human experience, either individual or corporate, is the vehicle of divine revelation. God is not made the sole actor on the plane of history, though His will is held to be finally effective. There is nothing in the teaching of the Bible, when viewed as a whole, to suggest that everything that happens in the history of nations is willed by God. Indeed, nations could not be condemned for their acts on the plane of history, as they are condemned, if they were regarded as helpless automata moved solely by the finger of God. Similarly, there is nothing in the teaching of the Bible, when viewed as a whole, to suggest that men should accept with fatalistic resignation every experience that comes to them as directly willed for them by God. Abel's murder at the hands of Cain was not God's will, but an offence against Him. Hence, if in the teaching of the Bible God can come to men through their experience or through national history, it is but when He chooses and in particular experiences alone.

IV

Again we find that God is held to reveal Himself in a book. When in the days of Josiah a book was found in the Temple, it was regarded as having divine authority and expressing the word and will of God which required the obedience of men. Jeremiah,

who seems at first to have advocated the acceptance of this book and obedience to its behests, later became doubtful of book revelation, because he recognized how capable of abuse it was and how easy it was to substitute obedience to its letter for obedience to its spirit. He spoke of the lying pen of scribes who falsified the word of God, and knew that such a process could lay upon men obligations which they would accept as from God when they had no higher origin than men's hearts. He spoke of the day when the law of God should be inscribed on men's hearts and not on any external material, and should be ingrained in their very spirit and inwoven in the texture of their personality. We know that not only the law-book of Josiah, but other books, including that in which Jeremiah's own words are preserved, came to be regarded as sacred, and the vehicle of divine revelation. The splendour of God is indeed seen through the Old Testament, of whose wonders they who study it can never tire. Its range, its variety, its exaltation, its relevance to men of every age, make it a book of enduring value, and through its word, the Word of God has reached the hearts of men in all generations, and will continue to do so, so long as they continue to read it.

Here, again, we have something which is not unique in kind amongst men. Other peoples have their sacred books, and much that is found in them is noble and exalted. Through them God has spoken to men and revealed something of His nature and will, and divine revelation through the medium of a book is no more peculiar to Israel than revelation through nature and experience. God has revealed something of His splendour through similar windows to men of many races, in so far as they had eyes to see and sensitiveness of spirit to receive and to transmit the revelation.

V

In saying this I have implied that every form of revelation is dependent in some measure on human personality. Revelation in Nature may be given equally to many men, but will not be received equally by them all. Those who have believed that revelation could be obtained by a technique have found trained personality alone to be capable of receiving it. Revelation in history or in experience needs to be interpreted before it is of value and needs wise personality for its understanding and interpretation. And revelation through a book is given through human writers, whose personality is also the medium of the divine activity. Yet more must be said about revelation through personality.

Fundamental to the faith of the Old Testament is the belief that God is personal, and that, because man is also personal with a personality that is in some sense made in the image of God, God

can have fellowship with him, can infuse his spirit with His own, and can for His own purpose identify Himself with him. That God is other than man is nowhere forgotten; that by the grace of God man is in some degree akin to God is also never forgotten. The kinship and the otherness are held in a tension which we are wise to remember, and without which the doctrine of the Incarnation becomes impossible of belief. Human personality may therefore be the medium of revelation not merely as the interpreter of sensations and experiences that come from without. The inner personality of a man may be lifted into the divine personality, and without any external stimulus the thoughts of God may arise in his heart. It is this which constitutes the essence of prophecy as the Old Testament understands it, and which makes it the supreme vehicle of Biblical revelation.

There is a place for the priest in revelation, though I cannot linger over it. The priest was not alone the man who understood the technique of sacrifice and the correct ritual of worship. He was also the custodian of tradition, and in a great variety of difficult matters his judgment was appealed to. He was wise with a wisdom not alone gathered by himself in the short course of his own life but inherited from those who had gone before and from ages before them. Many of the priests were unworthy and their condemnation is unsparing. But let us not forget that many prophets were also unworthy and they too are often condemned. Bad priests and bad prophets no more mean that the priesthood was essentially evil than that prophecy was essentially evil. That prophecy at its best was higher than priesthood even at its best few of us would doubt. But the priest, who was consecrated in spirit as well as by an outward act, could render no mean service in the transmission of the revelation and in its preservation.

To prophecy, however, we must give somewhat fuller attention. Its beginnings in Israel were not very exalted, and many who bore the name of prophets did not rise very high. The frenzied prophets we meet in some passages, whose wild behaviour could prove infectious and lead a Saul to throw off his clothes and roll about naked all night, were little different from the prophets of Baal who danced about and gashed themselves with knives, or from the prophets of the same type that have been found in other nations. Even the higher prophets, who came with an exalted message from God, are not without their fellows amongst other peoples. I cannot speak without respect of Confucius and Buddha and Zoroaster, and, in the earlier part of his career, there was a genuine prophetic quality about Mohammed. For the essence of prophecy is to be found, not in outward behaviour, but in the mediation to men of the message which the prophet receives from God through inner

inspiration. There were whole classes of prophets, both in Israel and elsewhere, who showed little of this quality. The false prophets of Israel are condemned for speaking a word which was not received from God but fabricated by themselves. Yet they always claimed that it was God's word. The prophet was the mouthpiece of God, so that the word given through him was in a profound sense not his but God's, bringing a revelation of the nature of God and the unfolding of His will. It was by the measure in which this was true of him that the truth or falsity of his prophetic status was to be measured. And this means that it was not always easy to separate true prophet from false, and that no simple line could be drawn so that all on one side were true prophets and all on the other side were false. The measure of the truth or falsity of his prophethood could only be spiritually discerned. In so far as he was a true prophet, he was a man who lived with God, in whose spirit the Spirit of God moved, who had looked on the heart of God and who saw the world in the light of that vision, who came to men with a revelation of God and who saw the consequence of that revelation for men.

VI

So far we have found nothing unique in kind in the Bible; and the avenues whereby God approached Israel and unveiled His glory to her were similar to those whereby He approached others, even though the revelation of His splendour to Israel surpassed that of any other people, and to her was given a greater knowledge of His nature and His will. We find, however, in the Old Testament a combination of some of these media of revelation in a single complex whole that is unique in character and also in significance. The first and greatest example of this is in the Exodus. That is often thought of as an outstanding example of the activity of God on the plane of history. It is far more than that. The story of the Exodus does not begin with the triumphant escape of a people from taskwork in Egypt under Moses, and then go on to tell how they ascribed their deliverance in retrospect to their God. It tells how Moses was called to a prophetic work; and the intertwining of the personal and prophetic medium of revelation with the divine control of history and of Nature must be remembered to perceive the full significance of this event. Moses was sent in the name of Jehovah to bring Israel out of Egypt, and Jehovah is said to be a divine name by which the Israelites in Egypt had not hitherto worshipped God. Here is a first indication that his mission did not arise merely from his own heart. Had it been born simply of his sympathy for his suffering fellows, he might have been expected to offer himself as their leader in the

name of God by which they normally worshipped Him. To go in the name of God whereby they would not know Him was needlessly to complicate his mission, unless he were profoundly persuaded that he was obeying a call that came not from himself. He came to Egypt and promised the Israelites deliverance. For a time, however, their faith in him was sorely tested, since he brought not deliverance but a heightening of their misery. Yet his faith in his mission never wavered. At the same time he knew that he had no material resources sufficient for the task he essayed. He did not summon the oppressed Israelites to revolt under his leadership, and to trust his God to give strength to their arm. He promised them deliverance by the sole power of God. At no point did he employ any material human force. When at last Pharaoh consented to let them go, he speedily relented and pursued them to bring them back. With unwavering confidence Moses promised a deliverance he could not achieve, a deliverance of which he and the people he led could only be spectators. It was effected by the forces of Nature, by wind and wave that gave them timely aid in their need and delivered them from Pharaoh and his hosts. Here was an outstanding event in the history of Israel, an event she could never forget. Yet it was more than an event in her history. Here was an example of the influence of Nature on human affairs. Yet it was far more than that. Here was an example of a great prophetic leader, who was profoundly convinced that he spoke the word of God and who subsequently gave them moral and spiritual leadership whose inner quality proclaimed that it was divinely inspired. Yet it was far more than that. All of these factors were intertwined together. A prophetic person, moved by a power he was sure was divine, promised a deliverance which he could not effect, and which was effected by means he could not foresee. The timely aid of wind and wave could not create his prior confidence, a confidence which was not reposed in Nature but in the God whose constraint he had obeyed. We have not to think only of Moses' interpretation of the deliverance after it was achieved, but of his prophetic work, both leading up to and arising out of the deliverance. And in the whole complex, we see a God who revealed Himself in the forces of Nature and on the plane of history, and Who also revealed himself through prophetic personality. Moreover, in the character of the act, we see the character of the God and not merely the evidence of His activity. He revealed Himself as a God of mercy and justice, hating the oppression of the weak by the strong; He revealed Himself as a saving God, not watching in impotent pity but active to help and to save; He revealed Himself as an electing God, choosing to Himself for His own purposes this people that hitherto had not

worshipped Him, and saving them by His grace ere He called for their pledge of loyalty to Himself; He revealed Himself as a God Whose demands on men arise out of His service to them, and Who exemplifies in Himself the qualities He demands of them.

Elsewhere in the Old Testament we find similar cases, though on a less notable scale. In the time of Deborah, the Israelites were assembled to fight for their freedom from Canaanite domination. This time they were not passive spectators but active for their own deliverance, though looking to their God to give them strength. Their deliverance came by a timely storm, which turned the Canaanite chariots into a grievous liability instead of an asset, and which determined the issue of the battle. In the time of Hezekiah, when Sennacherib sent his army against Jerusalem, deliverance came not by the city's military activity but by a plague that carried off great numbers of Sennacherib's army and so broke its spirit that the Assyrian was compelled to withdraw the remnants. Here, again, we have something more than divine activity on the plane of history through the control of forces that were beyond all human control. We miss the full significance of the story if we rest content with that, or if we concentrate on the timeliness of the aid that came. Wheeler Robinson has stressed the combination of personal and impersonal factors, and the importance of the prophetic personality to interpret the deliverance. Yet I think it is even more than that. The prior confidence of the prophetic person, and the assurance publicly given, have to be remembered alongside the vindication by means that could not be foreseen. Much of the prophetic message is often set down in modern works to the statesmanship of the prophets. They estimated the power of the mighty empires that surrounded Israel better than their contemporaries did. Or sometimes they are held to have based themselves on moral principles. A nation that flouted the will of God could not prosper in its way, and an Israel that had received the revelation of the divine character and will and had proved itself unworthy of the revelation must in disaster experience the discipline of God. All this is, probably, in a real measure true. Yet the prophet would have denied that he found his message by his own reflection, and would have declared that it was given to him by God. But in the cases I have noted, we cannot resort in any measure to considerations of statesmanship, and moral principles alone would scarcely have sufficed. No consideration of military resources could have inspired Israelite confidence in either case, and so far as Hezekiah and Sennacherib are concerned, Isaiah had all along held that revolt against Assyria was doomed to failure, yet here quixotically counselled passive resistance. In both of these cases we have a prior confidence on the part of the

prophet, based on factors which were invisible, and vindicated by means which the prophet could not possibly foresee. Deborah gathered the people together for revolt, persuaded that she was moved by the spirit of God, and communicating to the people her confidence that God would aid them, though not knowing by what means. The timely storm was therefore an answer to faith as well as to need, and the interpretation of the storm in terms of the divine activity on the plane of history was not born of subsequent reflection alone. Similarly in the case of Isaiah. When all the odds seemed on the side of the Assyrian, he counselled confidence and the refusal to yield, though neither he nor the people could have any confidence in Judah's resources, or could know by what means deliverance would be given. It is this prior working of the spirit of God on the prophet's spirit, taken together with the vindication by means which were entirely beyond human control, and the interplay of all these factors in a critical historical moment, that should be remembered together. And in each case the effective instrument of deliverance was not human activity. For even in the case of the battle of Taanach, the downpour of rain was more significant than any use of Israelite arms. It was not tactical errors of their opponents, or superior generalship on their side, or a superhuman heroism on the part of the Israelite warriors that gave them the victory. It was the deluge, that immobilized the chariots and rendered them worse than useless, that delivered up Sisera's hosts into their hands.

It may be said that religious leaders have often promised victory, and sometimes their promises have been fulfilled. Yet this can hardly be held to prove in every case the activity of God on the plane of history. But here there is much more than that. In the cases I have noted, the promises are given not by patriots who were always ready to claim God for their own nation, but by prophets, who were ready in the name of God to speak the unpopular word as readily as the popular. And in all these cases the response came by wholly unforeseeable and uncontrollable forces. In none of them do we find divine revelation along a single one of the lines along which men have commonly found the activity of God, but in a complex of factors that is of much the same pattern as that which marked the Exodus.

VII

But we can go farther. It might be expected that a God Who chose to reveal Himself to men would purpose a perfect revelation. The partial revelation could only be the pledge and promise of the fuller revelation. And since revelation through human personality is the highest form of revelation a personal God can use,

it might be expected that the supreme revelation would take a personal form. If the spirit of God can use the organ of human personality, and can, without its ceasing to be human personality, so mark it with His own spirit that it can become the instrument of His purpose, it would seem that only a perfect human personality could be the organ of the climax of divine revelation. Every workman is limited to some extent by the materials he uses, and even God is limited by the imperfections of the men He uses. Only the perfect Man could be so perfectly attuned to the Spirit of God that the fullness of the Divine glory could shine forth in Him.

To this a priori reasoning we may now bring the observation that in Christ we have the supreme example of such a complex as we have examined, where revelation is given through the organ of a human personality and through human experience, and at the same time through a historical event which went far beyond His inner and personal experience. It was not merely in the grandeur of His character and His word that Christ mediated the revelation of God. It was in His death that the love of God and the power of God were supremely displayed. And that death was brought on Him by the act of others in a moment of history which has proved itself to be of vital importance in the story of men. Whatever we may think of the Cross of Christ, and whether we like it or not, the undeniable fact is that it has exercised a unique influence on the subsequent history of the world. And the inner experience and character of Christ were bound up in that outer experience to which He was brought in a great moment of history. God's activity on the plane of history and His activity in the personality of Christ were inextricably bound together. And once more we find that it was not merely in retrospect that this event was discovered to be of vast significance. He Himself was persuaded in advance that His death would have unique significance for the world. His confidence has proved to be justified. Those two facts must be viewed together before their significance can be perceived. Neither could of itself produce the other. Moreover, the demonstrated power of the Cross of Christ was not merely an answer to His prior faith. It was the fulfilment of hopes and expectations which were deeply rooted in the Old Testament. For the Old Testament constantly looked to something beyond itself which should transcend its revelation, and in a remarkable way its hopes have been fulfilled in Christ. It looked for the day when Israel's God should be worshipped by men of every race, and when the law of Israel's God should be cherished throughout the world. How remarkably that hope has been fulfilled through Christ needs no demonstration. And it was a

fulfilment that could not be anticipated by any ordinary human foresight in the days of His flesh. It linked the world mission of Israel with the Suffering Servant, the organ of Whose service should be His suffering. And it cannot be gainsaid that the supreme organ of Christ's service, whereby His brief life and ministry in Galilee and Judaea became of universal and enduring significance, was His suffering. It is this rich combination of so many factors, some found in the texture of the personality of Christ, and some found in hopes and achievements which long preceded and long followed His earthly life, and some again in the acts of His contemporaries, which gives uniqueness to this complex of revelation.

Moreover, the content of the revelation here given is both surpassing in its quality and linked with the revelation of the Old Testament, and especially with the revelation in the Exodus and all that belonged to it. If the character of God as a pitying, electing and saving God stood forth in that earlier complex of factors, its revelation is renewed, but on a higher plane here. The divine pity for men, called forth not so much by their physical sufferings as by the more cruel bondage of sin to which they had delivered themselves, and springing out of the love which is of the essence of His own Being, shone forth in all the life of Christ, and especially in His death. The divine election, not of the Israel according to the flesh alone, but of all who will enter into the life and faith of Israel and become the heirs of the promises, the wider and spiritual Israel of which the prophets had spoken, became a reality through the death of Christ, as an innumerable company of men drawn from every nation under heaven can today testify. The saving power of God, more wonderful, profound and far-reaching than the power that carried Israel over the Red Sea, became active in the Cross of Christ. And just as in the Exodus the divine act of salvation became effective for an Israel that had faith to obey His prophet's word, and then, by the solemn constraint it laid upon men, called for the response in gratitude and loyalty embodied in the Covenant, so here the redeeming power of the Cross of Christ becomes effective for those who in faith and surrender respond to His grace, and then lays its sacred constraint on them in the call for consecration to His service. It is the same God Who is revealed here, but a greater measure of His glory is seen because the personal medium of the revelation is so much more closely one with Him. "We beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten Son of God"—a glory that was to be perceived in His Spirit and whose power was released in His death and resurrection.

VIII

In many ways has God revealed Himself to men of every race. In many ways He revealed Himself to Israel. In many ways He still reveals Himself to men. His glory is still to be seen in the heavens. And they who truly see that glory and perceive it to be the glory of God will not rest content with it. He still reveals Himself in individual experience, and approaches men through the common circumstances of their daily lives. Happy are they who are sensitive to His approach, and who hear the things He says to them. He still reveals Himself through inspired and prophetic personalities, through men who are attuned to His Spirit and whose word to our contemporary world is less their own than His. Blessed are they who are His mouthpiece and wise are they who hearken to their word. He still controls the course of history, not in the sense that its every detail reflects His will, but in the sense that He is the supreme actor on its stage and not an impotent spectator, and that He can use its process to further His ends. The supreme moment of revelation hitherto is to be found in a historical setting, in the life and death and resurrection of our Lord, Whose significance lies not alone in the past but in the present, and is of abiding importance to men. Nevertheless, the New Testament still looks forward to a yet greater climax of revelation, though one not unrelated to this. When the work of Christ finds a universal response, and all men find the spring of their life in Him, and the will of God is the universal basis of men's life, the glory of God shall be revealed in a way that shall surpass all that we can imagine. The yearning of men's hearts for peace, and their desire to create an organization that shall unite the nations for good and yield a glory such as earth has not yet known is to be commended. Yet is it vain if their trust is merely in a human organization rather than in one which is infused with the Spirit of God and rests on His will, and which is related to the revelation given in Christ.

To the Church of Christ the fullness of the divine revelation is given. To the Church of Christ the vision of a world redeemed, in which the splendour of God shall be more gloriously manifested, is given. The revelation and the vision are not for her alone, but to be shared with all men, and the vision cannot be realized until it is so shared. Upon the Church therefore rests a responsibility and a task, which she is not free to repudiate. For Christian theology is not alone speculative, but has practical corollaries. As Christ is the effulgence of the Father's glory, so must His Church be the effulgence of His glory, and through her the revelation of God's splendour must be mediated to the world.

BOOKS OF THE QUARTER

(The place of publication is London unless stated otherwise)

From Moses to Paul. *A Christological Study in the Light of our Hebraic Heritage.* By GEORGE A. F. KNIGHT. Lutterworth Press. 15s.

In this volume the Professor of Old Testament Studies at Knox College, Dunedin, attempts to show how it is the Hebraic background of the New Testament which best supplies a clue to the understanding of the Person of Christ. Following Wheeler Robinson, A. R. Johnson, Pedersen and others, he shows that man in the Old Testament is presented as *nephesh* (life-principle), which is indissolubly linked to *bâsâr* (flesh) and derives its potency from *ruach* (spirit). This *nephesh* of man can extend beyond itself, for example to other members of a man's household such as his servants: it can do this by means of such factors as a man's words, blessings, curses, *etc.* But, as is the human *nephesh,* so is the divine *nephesh;* and Professor Knight proceeds to explain how, just as the *nephesh* of a man constitutes not merely mathematical unity but a unity in a diversity formed by *nephesh, bâsâr* and *ruach,* so the nature of God is a unity in diversity of a somewhat analogous kind. The Being of God is such that He can extend beyond Himself, if such an expression be permitted. Thus the God who dwelt in Heaven can allow an extension of His real self to be present through His Word, His Name, His Angels, Metatron, *The Memra* (of the Targums), *The Torah,* The Tabernacling Presence, His Wisdom, The Shekinah. Chapters 4-9 are concerned with these extensions of the "personality" (*nephesh*) of God in the relevant literature; and the whole of the material presented is then related in chapters 10-13 to the Fourth Gospel, *Hebrews,* the Pauline Epistles, and the Synoptics in such a way as to show how they illuminate the problem of Christology in the New Testament. In brief, Christ is presented as "the earthly extension of the *nephesh* of God" (p. 163), and the various Christological terms in the New Testament are interpreted from this point of view. There follows a rich closing chapter on the Church as still further the extension of Christ's *nephesh.* The Christian community comes into being because "That projection of God's personality, the Person of Christ, actually offers to project His own personality into us, and make us, despite our sin and sorrow, as much one with Him as He is with God the Father" (p. 177).

The author has written clearly and attractively, and his presentation deserves serious consideration: he has great enthusiasm for his theme. But enthusiasm produces here, as so often, a two-fold reaction. On the one hand, we must agree with the author's main contention that the Hebraic heritage of the early Christian community is of crucial importance for the understanding of its Christology, as of other things. The author rightly, we believe, urges that Judaism is the *milieu* from which Christianity sprang, and he has collected much material from diverse sources which will serve as a useful synopsis for those who would understand the Hebraic background of Christological problems.

On the other hand, we must cry a halt. The reaction against Hellenistic influences on primitive Christianity, healthy as it is, has here gone too far. Professor Knight draws far too sharp a distinction in first century Judaism between what is Hebraic and Hellenistic. Like Dr. Snaith, he would separate Zion completely from Athens, whereas first-century Judaism

had, in fact, been impregnated to a considerable extent with Hellenistic concepts. It is a falsification to speak of the Greek and Hebrew mind as if they were totally different, as does the author of this book. It is significant in this connection that he does not include Dr. W. L. Knox's great book on *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* in his bibliography. In addition, as Dr. Curtis suggests, in his characteristic and satisfying foreword, the question must be asked whether in its missionary activity the Church, to some extent, at least, had to become Hellenized. Finally, there remains the question how far the half-personification of Wisdom, and other concepts in Judaism, can in fact help in Christological thinking where the essential problem is always how God became *Man*. In thanking Professor Knight for his stimulating book, we must ask him to ponder again words written on this very problem by Professor C. H. Dodd in *The Authority of the Bible* (p. 180): "The poetical half-personification of Wisdom [and, we may add, other similar half-personifications] evades rather than answers the question whether in religious experience one is in direct touch with a personal God, or only moved by a cosmic force". W. D. DAVIES.

The Earliest Christian Confessions. By OSCAR CULLMANN. Translated by J. K. S. REID. Lutterworth Press. 4s. 6d.

In this small book Professor Cullmann seeks to do for the earliest Christian confessions "the same thing as *Formgeschichte* has done for the Gospel tradition". The so-called Apostles' Creed "in its present form reaches back no further than the seventh or sixth century," and no existing creed is of the apostolic period. But from a study of the confessional formulæ to be found in the New Testament and in Christian writings of the second century light can be thrown on the nature and use of the earliest confessions and of their gradual elaboration.

Professor Cullman distinguishes five main types of circumstances in which a confession was found necessary: baptism and catechetical instruction; worship; exorcism; persecution; and polemic. He warns against the tendency to reduce the background to only one type, whether (as formerly) polemic or (as to-day) liturgy. The confession "Jesus is Lord", for instance, is to be seen partly as the positive counter-confession of those who were *persecuted* for refusing the Roman State's demand that they should say "Cæsar is Lord".

"The originally most widespread Christian confession is quite certainly the *purely Christological* formula": "Jesus (Christ) is Lord" or "Jesus is the Son of God". The prior reference to God in bipartite, and the inclusion of the Holy Spirit in tripartite, formulæ is not primitive, and "leads to a falsification of the perspective". For "it is as the Father of Christ that God is named 'Father' ": the Christian "reached God through Christ". "The Spirit was named originally only as a *gift received in baptism*"; and the association of "the forgiveness of sins" with the Spirit instead of with the death of Christ "again displaced the centre of gravity".

There is much here which is convincing—and which incidentally may be held to justify our confessional use of simple allegiance to Jesus as Lord in preference to longer credal formulae. It is "the *present* Lordship of Christ, inaugurated by His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of God, that is the centre of the faith of primitive Christianity". One may indeed hazard the suggestion that "Jesus (Christ) is risen" is a confession yet more primitive than those mentioned. The preaching in the first chapter of *Acts*, moreover, refers to God as subject in that He raised Christ from the dead. Is not this prior reference likely to have been present in the earliest confessions also?

Marcion and his Influence. By E. C. Blackman, B.D. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

The Thought of the Old Testament. By C. R. North. Epworth Press. 3s.

"The real battle of the second century centres around the Old Testament." Mr. Blackman quotes this dictum of Burkitt's, but it is not his text. Not till his last chaper does he consider "Marcion and the O.T.". He starts with "The Marcionite Church". This is followed by two chapters on Marcion and the N.T., with reference first to the Canon and secondly to the Text. Then we have three chapters on Marcion's Dualism, Christology and Paulinism. It is a strange order, and the book is a strange book. It is seven separate studies rather than a unity, and there is frequent repetition between the chapters. The title, too, may mislead; for there is little on the influence of Marcion's *thought* save a page and a half on Luther and Kagawa. Mr. Blackman inevitably leans on Harnack's *Marcion,* but he argues that Harnack vastly over-estimated Marcion's importance and originality: "Marcion's must have been a pedestrian mind"; "to the deepest things in religion he is insensitive". Something of this pedestrian quality has got into the book, which offers few fresh or original insights. This is so, however, partly because Mr. Blackman is so honestly tentative, often remarking "the very paucity of our knowledge". It is, indeed, less in his broad judgments than in his detailed scholarship that the quality of his book appears. His work on Marcion and the N.T. text is particularly fine: the appendix, "Did Marcion's text influence the Old Latin?", is considerably longer than any chapter. This is a book whose learning all must admire (the Greek and Latin are not translated). For specialists it may well prove exciting and of permanent value.

Meanwhile, "the real battle of the second century" remains our own battle. When, as at present, the continuity between the Old and New Testaments is stressed, rather than their contrast, we need those who can portray it as a spiritual and expanding continuity, not a static or legalistic. Professor North does this admirably in his three Vacation School Lectures on God, The World and Salvation in *The Thought of the Old Testament.* "Old Testament religion was, in its essential principles, as much a religion of grace as that of the new". Yahweh's covenant relation to Israel "was in origin the most intimate and tender of all relationships". "There is a great deal in the O.T. about forgiveness". "The O.T. and N.T. are at one in placing Salvation and Redemption at the centre of their message. Creation is by comparison almost an afterthought". There may be something to be said for Marcion's "emphasis on soteriology to the neglect of cosmology", after all.

Geoffrey F. Nuttall.

The Meaning of Human Existence. By Leslie Paul. Faber. 16s.

This book reminds me of two classics of theology. On the one hand it resembles Bonaventura's *Itinerarium Mentis in Deum,* inasmuch as it seeks to exhibit the whole of experience as a stairway leading up to God. On the other hand it still more recalls the *Confessions* of Augustine, in so far as it retails the movements and the persons that have helped the writer to climb the stair: in place of Monica, the pagan schools, the Manichees, the Neoplatonists, Ambrose and Victorinus, we have Schrödinger, Bertrand Russell, Kierkegaard, Dilthey, Buber, and so on. In fact the book is a live document, showing how with these helps Mr. Leslie Paul has advanced from the "modern perplexity" to the "Christian certainty".

The argument is complicated, and it is extremely difficult to shorten it without unfairness to some of its points. Nevertheless, the attempt at a summary must be made: the main points would seem to be as follows:—

The world, being finite both in space and in time, is not a place where every possible permutation of the atoms composing it can happen: only a limited number of permutations, however great that number, can take place. Hence the same configurations of the atoms cannot occur over and over again; and a progressive evolution in the universe is at least possible. Such an evolution appears to exist in the series of organisms, which in opposition to the general running down of the universe, show a tendency to maintain and increase an orderly upward progress. Biology transcends physics, and similarly psychology transcends biology: we have in the universe a process of emergent evolution. The category of physics is causality, that of biology is life, that of psychology is personality; and the higher can never be explained in terms of the lower.

The actual universe, however, consists of individuals: in the realm of physics these are *things,* in that of biology *organisms,* in that of psychology *persons* who are selves and free agents. Moreover, a self discerns in the world other selves. As selves, we stand not only in the relation of I and It, but also in that of I and Thou.

Further, we are constrained to recognize the reality both of the external world of things and organisms, and also, though in a different way, the reality of the selves, both as I and as Thou. All are substances, if of various orders: we cannot do without the category of substance.

From every part of what has been enumerated and described there is a way to God. The fact of the universe, the order of emergent evolution, the existence of human society bring us to the threshold of religion, in so far as they need an explanation. But in religious experience we have more than such an explanation: we have the immediacy of a Thou, which is the Absolute on which our souls depend. It is not wrong to connect this inward apprehension of God with the external universe. However transcendent God may be, He cannot be exiled from the world: his very transcendence implies an immanence in it.

But what can be the relation of the Absolute to the selves whose very principle is freedom? Especially, how can they be related to selves that have used their freedom amiss, as history shows? The only solution of this problem, is to recognize that God, in bestowing freedom on man, suffers with him when he goes wrong, and so redeems him. This is the meaning of the Incarnation and the Cross. All love is suffering: the Incarnation and the Cross reveal the love of God through the suffering of God.

So far the summary: it will be evident from it, insufficient though it be, that the book is both interesting and valuable: it is a sustained attempt to state a thoroughly modern theistic argument, and it is most informing by reason of the full account given of many dominant teachers and doctrines of recent times: unfortunately the summary could only suggest, not show this latter feature of Mr. Paul's work. This work must be regarded with sympathy by all who today seek to maintain a theistic view of the universe, with admiration too for the strenuous efforts made. But there are some doubtful points in the argument. The general doctrine of modern physicists is that the universe is finite in space, but not in time. It seems wrong, too, to equate love and suffering: suffering belongs to time, but love can be eternal: as such it can transcend both time and suffering.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Christian in Philosophy. By J. V. LANGMEAD CASSERLEY. Faber. 18s.

This is a most interesting book, and, so far as I can judge, an important one. It claims that the primary tradition in Christian philosophy is Augustinian, and that the discovery of critical history has released

philosophy from the cramping bonds of Greek logic to do full justice to the meaning of "singular" events, and thus vindicate at once biblical theology and a genuine metaphysic. The book is well written and even those who dissent from some of its conclusions will be grateful for its stimulus.

The title of the book and its two parts might suggest that the Christian can dictate to the philosopher—but this is far from the author's intention. The first part of the book is an original and illuminating survey of the history of philosophy. The most distinctive achievement here is the bringing of some kind of perspective into post-Hegelian philosophy—but the treatment is refreshing all through. It begins by insisting that Greek logic could not handle the Christian concern for the singular and the personal. It sees Anselm as the channel for the persistence of Augustinian philosophy—though the analogical character of the ontological argument is hidden by its demonstrative form, and its real justification hidden by the absence of historical content. St. Thomas Aquinas was not a real philosopher: he is the type and standard of the Christian apologist. The study of rationalists and empiricists should lead us to the awareness that mathematical thinking cannot do justice to history and personal experience. The philosophy of Kant leads to the protracted modern debate between idealists, positivists and existentialists.

In the second part of the book Mr. Langmead Casserley discusses the present task of philosophy and the function of the Christian in clarifying it and helping to meet it. The problem of philosophy is indeed a problem of language—but what is in question is not merely theology, but also history, drama, and common speech. The author attempts to answer Miss Emmet's criticism of Brunner that the acceptance of revelation presupposes a philosophical criterion, and gives a valuable discussion of the necessity and limitations of historical relativism. He indicates both the function of the Bible as providing the depth of perspective the Christian philosopher needs, and the function of the Christian philosopher as in fact "vindicating what we may call 'the sovereignty of the Word' throughout the length and breadth of human thought and enquiry". The author might with advantage have reflected on the long-term positive function of logical positivism before turning to criticize it, and he has not plumbed all the depths of the relation between revelation and history in this interesting and important discussion. Some of the questions raised by Professor J. M. Creed in his Hulsean Lectures on the Divinity of Jesus Christ still await an answer.

This is a very fresh and stimulating book. It may be commended to all interested in the meaning of history, in biblical theology and in the possibility of a wide embracing Christian philosophy coming from within the characteristic influences of our time. H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

Alfred North Whitehead, 1861-1947. By DOROTHY EMMET. Cumberlege. 3s.

Harold Arthur Prichard, 1871-1947. By H. H. PRICE. Cumberlege. 4s. 6d.

W. B. Yeats: Man and Poet. By A. NORMAN JEFFARES. Routledge & Kegan Paul. 21s.

> In our own lives, and at any one moment, there is a focus of attention, a few items in clarity of awareness, but interconnected vaguely and yet insistently with other items in dim apprehension, and this dimness shading off imperceptibly into indiscriminated feeling. Further, the clarity cannot be segregated from the vagueness.

That is A. N. Whitehead, not Virginia Woolf; and from a philosopher it is striking. Prichard, who published little and was little known outside

Oxford, "could see little good in the logic of Russell and Whitehead". Yet, read together, these two British Academy memoirs reveal interesting similarities. Prichard, for instance, stressed "the immediate and intuitive character of our apprehension of duties"; Whitehead "held that speculative metaphysics should start from the elements disclosed in immediate experience". For Prichard, again, "strictly speaking, there *are* no colours or sounds; there is only someone-seeing-a-colour, someone-hearing-a-sound, etc." and "A cause . . . is a *substance acting*"; for Whitehead, "The world of which we are aware in perception can be described as a world made up of events", and "Our basic experience is not the tidy world of scientific concepts, but a sense of *something going on*". Once more, Prichard had "a certain admirable simplicity and integrity which impressed all who knew him"; so Whitehead "possessed a quality which might be described by one of his own terms—*massive simplicity*".

W. B. Yeats shared Prichard's dislike of Bertrand Russell ("Damn Bertrand Russell. He's a proletarian"), but Whitehead he liked "because of something aristocratic in his mind. His packed logic, his difficult scornful lucidity seems to me the intellectual equivalent of my own imaginative richness of suggestion—certainly I am nothing if I have not these". The arrogance is characteristic, but the comparison will bear reflection. Certainly Yeats was imaginatively rich. In about 1906 he wrote in his diary, "One has a thousand ideas". Twenty years later he wrote, "I have lots of subjects in my head", and "I suppose the words are but the finger on the trigger, and that the gun has been long loaded".

A prime virtue of Dr. Jeffares' full-length and fully-documented study of Yeats is his use of quotations from letters and other unpublished prose material; for in his letters, as well as in his poems, especially in his letters to Maud Gonne, Lady Gregory and Dorothy Wellesley, Yeats gave much of himself. In return Maud Gonne gave him wildness at the starting post; and the other two gave him great houses, where "he found peace, and quietude, and, above all, an order in life". This Yeats needed, as Rilke needed it, to offset his own mental excitement. "One goes on year after year getting the disorder of one's mind in order, and this is the real impulse to create". "I have always been unhappy when I wrote and worked with great difficulty". "Whatever I do poetry will remain a torture".

We singers have nothing of our own
All our hopes, our loves, our dreams
Are for the young, for those whom
We stir into life.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

The Rev. Norman Goodall's *One Man's Testimony* (Independent Press, 6s.) is distinctly, as the title says, a personal testimony. It is a confession of faith, but it goes beyond that into the background of spiritual experience, and of what holds a man to the faith in a troubled world. A thread of autobiography runs through the book, and necessarily so for the testimony to have its complete force; but the main argument rests on the larger outlook of the writer's wide experience of Christian fellowship. Mr. Goodall acknowledges as outstanding influences his early home life, and the grip on him of the Christian Church. The book is written with a charming modesty, and has in it nothing of a hard dogmatism. A narrative of this kind is not for criticism. It is to be read sympathetically and with understanding.

The Rev. John Murray's *The Bible and our Prayers* (Independent Press, 4s.) is an exceedingly good little manual of personal devotion. Its outlines of methods of prayer, especially those on "Intercession" and "The Holy Spirit", are well done; they are not afraid of homely detail. Each section has a number of brief prayers (most of our prayers are too long) and also suitable Bible readings. Mr. Murray believes that the ideal manual is the Bible; a view one would like to see more frequently enforced. I should like to bring this book to the notice of my brother ministers; they would find it helpful among their young people.

Mr. Reginald Reynolds' *The Wisdom of John Woolman* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) contains a very representative selection from the works of Woolman, and will give the reader who does not know the *Journal* a good idea of the man and his teaching. Woolman is one of the most attractive of the Quakers. In an introductory paper Mr. Reynolds describes him, and his background. In a foreword Mr. Stephen Hobhouse remarks that Woolman's *Journal* has been for 170 years the best read and best known of any Quaker book.

Dr. Rufus Jones' *A Call to What is Vital* (Macmillan, $2.00) is in effect a claim for the mystic way as understood by the Society of Friends. It has in mind college students who are drifting from Christian faith; the questions of criticism and the new knowledge are frankly considered; and its plea is for a spirituality which is aware of the world as it is, but is also aware of a world beyond. There are other realities in the universe than those which are successfully handled in our laboratories.

The first part of Mr. R. M. Hazelton's *In Our Midst* (Island Press, $3.00) is an outline of the Quaker position, and of the apprehension of religion under the guidance of the inner light. The second part deals with the lives of three early Friends, James Nayler, Job Scott, and David Sands. These three papers are very revealing; they are based on the truth that mysticism is an immediate awareness of relation to God. This is a very interesting book, well written, and a pleasure to read.

Dr. Hugh Martin's *Luke's Portrait of Jesus* (S.C.M., 6s.) will give the general reader a connected view of Luke's narrative, and of its distinctive character. It has scholarship behind it, and an expository gift; and it brings out Luke's contribution in his Gospel to the interpretation of the life of Christ. I am not sure if Dr. Martin does not assume on Luke's part a greater independence of the common sources of the Synoptics than may be actually the case. But this is rather a question of source criticism.

Dr. C. S. Lewis' *Transposition and Other Addresses* (Bles, 2s. 6d.)

consists of five addresses; the first was given in Mansfield College Chapel; two of the others at S. Mary's, Oxford; and a memorial address, "The Inner Ring", at King's College, London. These are modern examples of University preaching.

For busy people who can secure only a few moments in the day for private prayer, Dr. R. Dunkerley has compiled a book of prayers, *The Secret Moment* (Lutterworth Press, 2s. 6d.). There are prayers for each day in the month, and also passages of scripture. Under the title "Glimpses of Christ" we have a selection of Christ's sayings. Dr. Dunkerley has included a chapter of apposite quotations from general literature. This is a manual somewhat away from the usual lines, and has an appeal of its own.

The Symbol of the Faith, by Dr. George Hedley (Macmillan, $2.50), is a study clause by clause of the Apostles' Creed. There is some account of the history of the Creed, and of its interpretation. In the main Dr. Hedley is conservative in his view, but there are points where changes of emphasis and sometimes of meaning are difficult to reconcile with the traditional use. Still, Dr. Hedley says he can repeat the Creed; and apparently would include it in the daily service of the Church. The whole of this study is carefully done, and breathes a spirit of Christian tolerance and charity. But I feel after reading it that there is a valid case for the Congregational churches in not using any of the Creeds in the worship of the Church.

Another exposition of the Apostles' Creed, but of a different texture, is Monsignor Ronald Knox's *The Creed in Slow Motion* (Sheed & Ward, 8s. 6d.). This is a series of sermons delivered to the girls at the Assumption Convent at Exton. The sermons carry the *Nihil Obstat* of the censor, and are apparently of flawless orthodoxy.

The Rev. John Burnaby's book in the "Colet Library", *Is the Bible Inspired?* (Duckworth, 6s.) marks the difference between the traditional Christian belief and the view which has emerged in recent times. This is a very good bit of modern apologetic. Inspiration consists primarily "in the power to see those things which God hath revealed to us by His Spirit"; and so regarded the Bible "has an inspiration which is really unique".

The Rev. G. W. J. Cameron-Price's *The Mirror of God* (Independent Press, 6s.) has a freshness of treatment and a depth of feeling which make it welcome. In letters supposed to be written by St. John to his brother in Rome we are given the impression made by Christ on the Apostle; in other words we are given what may be called John's view of Christ and His teaching. There is imagination at work here; and perhaps what we have is Mr. Cameron-Price's view.

Two Roman Catholic books, translated from the French, and both of them marked by deep religious feeling, are Father Sertillanges' *What Jesus saw from the Cross* (Clonmore & Reynolds, 8s. 6d.), and Father Jean Daniélou's *The Salvation of the Nations* (Sheed & Ward, 6s.). The first resolves itself into a series of studies of the central things in Christ's life, and has an excellent chapter on the Upper Room. The second has a missionary interest. These books come to close quarters in many places with the interior life of the soul.

The Rev. Alan Walker's *Christianity on the Offensive* (Epworth Press, 6s.) contains twenty sermons preached in the Waverley Methodist Church, Sydney. They have a positive note in them. Mr. Walker believes that the conditions have not been so favourable for two hundred years for a Christian offensive throughout the world.

The Rev. John Wilkinson's *More Things by Parables* (Epworth Press, 5s.) continues from a former volume his expositions of the parables. These are plain, straightforward sermons. I was interested to see Mr. Wilkinson's quotation from *Bishop Blougram's Apology*; the lines beginning, "Just when we are safest". I can remember when we all quoted Browning. Is he coming back again? A. T. S. JAMES.

That the Roman Church is as alive as other Churches to the necessity of providing intelligible modern translations of the Bible is evidenced once again by the appearance of the first volume (*Genesis-Esther*) of *The Old Testament newly translated from the Latin Vulgate* by Mgr. Ronald A. Knox (Burns, Oates, 21s.). It differs from the same translator's version of the Vulgate New Testament in English (1945) in not being officially recognized for Church use. Frequent reference is made in footnotes to the Hebrew variants from the Latin, as well as to the Greek. The translation has the clarity and smoothness which are attractive features of Mgr. Knox's New Testament. The volume is sumptuously produced, and very well printed in clear type.

Mr. George Whitfield's *God and Man in the Old Testament* (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.) is a simple and straightforward attempt to show what answers the Old Testament gives to the questions: "Who is God?", "What is the meaning of history?", "What is God like?", "What does God want?", "How does God speak?" and "What are the limits of religion?" Generous quotations are made from the Revised Version, and these are judiciously chosen as typical passages from which to discover the way in which the Old Testament writers thought about these matters. The religion of the Old Testament is not treated in isolation, but every opportunity is taken to remind the reader of its climax in the New.

The place of the myth in Scripture is the subject of Mr. Frank Buchanan's *The Baptism and Temptations of Christ* (James Clarke, 6s.). The first four chapters appeared in the *Presbyter* during 1946. The modern man wants the stark fact, while the Jew regarded the mythological interpretation of the fact as truer even than the fact itself. "The myth is greater than the facts of life, and will gather them up into itself". The myth here treated is that of water as not only destructive, but creative, as representing both death and life. A beginning is made with the creation, when life emerged from the waters, only to be subsequently destroyed by the deluge, a *motif* which is repeated until the myth is fulfilled in the baptism of Christ, who brings the new created order. The hope of Israel was fulfilled because Christ in His temptations refused to perform His appointed task in the devil's way. This is an interesting study for those who like this kind of thing; but it does not get us very far in the end, while the danger of the merely fanciful is always just around the corner.

Professor A. M. Hunter is well known for several popularizing books on the New Testament. His latest book, *The Gospel according to Saint Mark* (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.) is the first of the new "Torch Bible Commentaries". Based on the Authorized Version, it is meant for the general reader, and therefore, while relying on the results of modern scholarship, it chiefly emphasizes the religious meaning of the Gospel. I commend it especially to teachers. We look forward to future volumes in the series, to which Dr. Hunter's contribution is an auspicious beginning.

The Rev. Gwilym O. Griffith's *St. Paul's Gospel to the Romans* (Oxford: Blackwell, 10s. 6d.) is not a verse-by-verse commentary, but a treatment of the teaching of *Romans* under such headings as "Justification and Atonement", "God in History", "Church and State". These discussions are

preceded by two chapters on the background and nature of the Epistle, and by a paraphrase of it, and followed by a questionnaire which deals with questions raised in a discussion group. Mr. Griffith, who already has some reputation as an interpreter, is thoroughly at home in interpreting Paul in plain modern language. This book is very good indeed, and will be invaluable not least to the preacher who wishes to bring before his congregation in a digestible form the riches of Pauline theology, which is of permanent relevance and validity. A. J. B. Higgins.

In *Essentials of Demonology* (Epworth Press, 15s.) Dr. Edward Langton has attempted first to gather together the facts concerning demons in primitive communities, Arab and Early Hebrew communities, and among the Babylonians and Assyrians. This part of his work forms a foil over against which he sets the demonology of the Old Testament and Rabbinical literature, in both of which he naturally traces strong Persian influences. There follow chapters on Greek demonology and that of the Apocryphal Literature. After this vast accumulation of details from all these directions Dr. Langton turns to the New Testament.

There has long been need of a book such as this to gather together isolated discussions of the details of demonology scattered in many places: Dr. Langton has provided a convenient and very well arranged storehouse of material. There are, however, places where there is a failure to appreciate recent work. In minor details also there is a lack of due consideration of all points of view: thus Dr. Langton accepts Charles' dating of *I Enoch* without mentioning other views. As a rich quarry of information for Biblical demonology in its proper setting this work will be most useful: its weakness is that it is merely a quarry, and that the author has offered no satisfying interpretation of the material found in the quarry.

W. D. Davies.

Everyone who met the late Professor W. G. de Burgh will be glad that his last volume, *The Life of Reason* (Macdonald & Evans, 15s.), has been posthumously edited and published. He contends that "whenever in our experience there is conscious unification of diverse elements, be the unity discovered in the real, or constructed by human agency; whenever we discern or produce form in a given material, be it in sense-perception, or a work of art, in moral or economic action, in scientific, philosophical or religious thinking—there intellect or reason" (terms Professor de Burgh used synonymously) "is at work". This is the kind of perspective which the Christian mind must welcome, particularly when it is the Christian experience which is the determining factor in the philosophical construction. The only comment that needs to be made is that the language is that of an older generation and that the essential convictions of Professor de Burgh have to be expressed in new terms. But the wealth of Professor de Burgh's learning and insight, particularly in his use of the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas, gives us a perspective we cannot afford to lose. Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is his criticism of Samuel Alexander's treatment of immanence and transcendence in defence of the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation.

A great many books are being written today about Frederick Denison Maurice. And rightly. Because he was one of the great nineteenth century figures from whom we have much to learn today. We may be grateful to Dr. Alec Vidler for giving us in his Hale Lectures (1947) entitled *The Theology of F. D. Maurice* (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.) a skilful presentation of Maurice's contentions in his own words. In particular we need to rejoice that Maurice gives a different perspective to theology from that centred in

the fall of man (and both Protestant and Catholic have been guilty of this). For Maurice the supreme truth is that Christ is the King and Head of the race. "St. Paul", he says, "speaks of the Mystery of Christ as the ground of all things in Heaven and Earth, the History as the practical discovery or revelation of this ground"; and Maurice attributed the goodness in any man and in all men to the grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit, and claimed it for the Church. This is a very useful book.

In *The Crisis of the Human Person* (Longmans, 12s. 6d.) Mr. J. B. Coates has provided a useful introduction to the English works of some notable modern thinkers. Berdyaev, Buber, and Mumford he classifies as Personalists; Mannheim, Laski, and Burnham as Neo-Marxists; Heard, Aldous Huxley and Koestler as defeatists. Herbert Read is described as an Anarchist, and C. S. Lewis and J. M. Murry achieve a balance of good and bad. These introductions are competently done, and the book is interesting to read. Any philosophy compatible with the Christian faith must be personalist in character, and the standpoint Mr. Coates adopts must win sympathy from Christian people. We may, however, comment that it is not clear that the criticism of Mannheim does justice to his insight into the inevitable character of a technical society; or that the religion of Aldous Huxley as distinct from his politics is really satisfactory; or that we can deal with the crisis of the human person without expounding the overcoming of sin.

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology, by Dr. H. R. McAdoo (Longmans, 12s. 6d.)—a learned and illuminating summary of the teaching of the Anglican Caroline divines—is "an investigation of principles, being an attempt to answer the double question, Is there a native Anglican moral theology, and, if so, how far is it reformed and how much does it owe to scholastic influence?" Dr. McAdoo shows the indebtedness of these divines both to Thomas Aquinas and to Calvin and illustrates their dependence both on Scripture and on the Fathers. Full statements are given of the moral teaching of Hooker, Sanderson, Jeremy Taylor and Bramhall as well as many references to other theologians of this period. An interesting chapter on "Mortal and Venial Sin" illustrates the "reforming strain" in these writers. Thus Thorndike writes: "That some sins are less than others it is confessed; but that any sins are properly venial, we deny. . . . To be a *Sin* and yet be *venial,* is in proper terms, no better than a flat contradiction". The last chapter gives a very attractive account of "The Spiritual Life in the English Church" of this period: its ordered piety, the emphasis on the necessity of meditation and the endeavour "to fill all men's waking hours and invest their every occupation with the sense of consecration to an eternal destiny".

Professor H. A. R. Gibb's *Mohammedanism* (Oxford Press, 5s.) is a very useful addition to the "Home University Library" in which it takes the place of Dr. D. S. Margoliouth's volume with the same title published in 1911. It is distinguished from the earlier book in that, as its sub-title indicates, it is *An Historical Survey*. We found of special interest its last chapter on "Islam in the Modern World". This book is as lucid as it is learned and within the limits of its space provides an admirable introduction to the study of Islam.

SYDNEY CAVE.

Mr. H. E. Roberts' architectural *Notes on the Medieval Monasteries and Ministers of England and Wales* (S.P.C.K., 12s. 6d.) include references to "all the medieval establishments . . . wherever . . . there is anything appreciable existing above ground or discernible as uncovered foundations",

and are arranged alphabetically in order of counties under the three headings Monks, Canons, Friars. These lists appear unrelated to those published by Cardinal Gasquet in *English Monastic Life* or more recently by Dom David Knowles in *The Religious Houses of Medieval England.* A feature of the book is its many fine photographs of the monastic buildings, mostly ruins, briefly described in the text.

The Rev. G. H. Cook has followed his *Portrait of Durham Cathedral* with *Portrait of Canterbury Cathedral* (Phoenix House, 12s. 6d.). This includes 70 fine photographs of one of our most magnificent cathedrals, covering architectural detail as well as general views, and Mr. Cook has written a clear account, with due attention to the place of the cathedral in English history as well as to its own architectural development. The publishers deserve congratulations for this series.

In 1514 a London merchant named Hunne, soon after suing his parish priest for claiming Hunne's dead infant's bearing-sheet by way of a mortuary fee, was himself prosecuted for heresy, imprisoned in the Lollard's Tower at Old St. Paul's, and there found dead. The Church argued for suicide, but a jury pronounced it murder, and the Bishop of London's Chancellor was suspected as the murderer. The Commons stood by the jury and Hunne's family, and attacked the claim to "benefit of clergy" which protected a cleric from secular trial. The spiritual Lords were too strong for them, but 14 years later, after a period in which, except for one brief session, Parliament had not met, they returned to the attack. They now passed a bill abolishing mortuaries in kind, and also complained to the King of the bishops' secret inquisitions and arbitrary imprisonment of heretics. In *The Tragedy of the Lollards' Tower* (Oxford: Pen-in-Hand, 21s.) the Rev. Arthur Ogle argues the close relations of Hunne's case to the legislation of this Reformation Parliament; he also, from a MS. Lollard Bible discovered by him at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, adduces fresh evidence that Hunne was in fact murdered. He tells his story clumsily and is not reliable in every detail, but he has made a case, and it is an interesting case.

The Love Letters of Henry VIII (Wingate, 9s.) sounds like a novel, but is not so. Mr. Henry Savage has printed, with translations when the letters are in French, 17 letters from Henry to Anne Boleyn, and one each to Jane Seymour, Anne of Cleves and Katharine Parr. The letters to Anne Boleyn are from Vatican MSS., and have not been printed accurately before. The book includes excellent facsimiles, from which the following is taken: "no more to yow at thys present myne owne darlyng for lake off tyme but that I wolde yow were in myne arms or I in yours for I thynk it long sinc I kyst yow". Mr. Savage modernizes the spelling.

The Rev. John Huxtable has printed an abridgment of John Owen's *True Nature of a Gospel Church and its Government* (Jas. Clarke, 5s.), with a brief introduction. "The Church, *not the minister,* celebrates the Eucharist"; the last three words (though not the sentiment) ring strange in a Congregational manual, but Mr. Huxtable has Anglican readers in mind here. Congregationalists he points more especially to Owen's sections on excommunication and on the communion of churches. In the latter Owen approves "a synod convened in the name of Christ, by the voluntary consent of several churches concerned in mutual communion", as having authority "from the promised presence of Christ". "The theology of the Church Meeting", Mr. Huxtable holds, "is applicable to union assemblies". Congregationalists have never been all of one type, even Owen's, but all will be grateful for this reappearance of a classic.

Dr. Edward Carpenter's recent life of Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, has been followed by the Rev. A. Tindal Hart's *Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York* (S.P.C.K., 21s.), Tenison's contemporary and rival. Sharp's paternal grandfather was an ejected minister, and Sharp was not afraid to befriend another ejected minister, Richard Frankland; but the older he grew, the more High Church he became. After the accession of Queen Anne, whose favour he won, he took an increasingly leading part in ecclesiastical affairs; though in the Lords "Sharp didn't jump at all. He preferred to sit on the fence". "Gradually Tenison, who had been William's right-hand man in clerical matters, was forced into the background . . . ; and from 1710 until Sharp's death in February 1713/14, York rather than Canterbury dominated the Anglican Church". In his diocese he strove to create "a resident priesthood whose private lives, zeal, preaching ability and parochial efficiency should stand above reproach"; and "more than any other bishop of his day Sharp saw his ideals realized". The special value of this volume is that it uses the Lloyd-Baker-Sharp MSS., which contain a quantity of the Archbishop's correspondence.

Democracy and the Quaker Method (Bannisdale Press, 8s. 6d.), by F. E., B. E. and R. S. W. Pollard, is informative and not unimportant, but is disappointing in claiming both too much and too little. The Quaker method of taking the sense of the meeting instead of voting, of seeking together to discover God's will "in love, coolness, gentleness and dear unity", and of seeking, in case of acute division, to regain unity in a period of worship, is a fine method, which deserves to be commended to Christians generally. But it is not a Quaker invention or preserve, though the Quakers have been more faithful in its continuance than other "gathered churches". On the other hand, it cannot be effective except among those who are met to seek God's will, with faith in Him and in one another; it is not simply group co-operation applicable in a secular context, as these writers seem to suggest: it is not, in fact, democracy.

The sub-title of Canon Harold Anson's intriguing memoir of *T. B. Strong* (S.P.C.K., 8s. 6d.), *Bishop, Musician, Dean, Vice-Chancellor,* rightly suggests the impossibility of pinning down Strong's elusive personality; so does the startling difference between the drawing, portrait and photograph of him included in this book. Strong was a bishop who was "usually a dull preacher", a musician who suggested that "one hymn a year, and that on Ash Wednesday, was all the singing needed at public worship", and a Dean of Christ Church who in his own writing "did not shine"; he was also "incredibly shy" and "not interested in women as such". Despite all this, his inexhaustible affection for his young men told deeply; in suggesting the sensitivity and saintliness which accompanied it, Canon Anson has made this memoir something more than a piece of social documentation (which already seems hardly credible). GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The Atomic Age (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) contains the Halley Stewart Lectures (1948) delivered by six eminent authorities who consider from their several points of view the fateful gift of atomic energy to civilized man. Of these Mr. R. F. Harrod on the economic consequences is (surprisingly) much the most interesting and least alarmist, holding that birth control may prove to be a much more paralyzing factor in the new order. Mr. Bertrand Russell reluctantly concludes that temporarily the security of civilization has become more important than liberty. Mr. Lionel Curtis argues that the over-riding necessity is to establish the reign of law before it is too late. Professor Brogan considers the moral responsibility now resting on the

American people. Professor Oliphant describes the scientific achievements which have brought us where we are and Professor Blackett repeats the strategical arguments more fully expounded in his recent book.

World Revolution in the Cause of Peace, by Mr. Lionel Curtis (Oxford: Blackwell, 7s. 6d.), is written under the stress of an urgent belief that, unless Europe can solve its political problem before atomic energy is available for widespread use in war, nothing can save us. He finds an analogy between the present state of Europe and the situation in America in 1787 when the wiser statesmen, trying to bring the Revolution to an end, found themselves helpless in face of the claims of the several States to independent sovereignty. That deadlock was broken by the adoption of a Constitution which gave to the United States the responsibility for the defence of the whole Union and for establishing a supreme Federal Court of Justice. It was the adoption of a form of collective security, the recognition that so far as the States were concerned 'peace was indivisible'. On that basis peace was established, the Union grew and prospered, until in the 20th century the U.S. finds itself one State among many in the world facing the same problem of insecurity and fear of war.

Tomorrow's Continent, by Lt.-Col. Peter Penn and his wife Lucie Street (Sidgwick & Jackson, 9s.), is written out of a knowledge of Africa and India over some 30 years and much administrative experience in Africa, whose future, the authors believe, may in the next century be as magnificent as America's in the last. They believe that British experience in India provides both example and warning. Material development must go hand in hand with the intellectual and spiritual development of the African people. There is limitless scope for modern technology and there is the promise of the solution of many of our most pressing problems in Europe. There is also the debt to be repaid which Britain and America incurred in the days of the slave trade. A whole continent waits to serve and be served. The wilderness fights back with its own terrible weapons—the tsetse fly, the worm and native ignorance. The fly we hope is under sentence, but the physique of the African is ruined by disease. "No less than 90 per cent of all Africans are infested with worms."

The Wholeness of the Church (S.C.M. Press, 5s.), by the Rev. O. S. Tomkins, is an admirable account of the present situation as it has developed and is developing under the pressure of the conscious need in all branches of the Church for "ecumenicity". The author is the associate General Secretary of the World Council, whose very existence, with the provisions of its constitution, is evidence that a unity of some kind is already realized, within which are various divisions and even formal separations. But there are those who have the spirit of Christ in every denomination. They recognize one another and are recognizable by the world outside. It is salutary to remember that every issue on which the churches are divided (perhaps Rome must be excluded) is secondary. A great responsibility rests upon those who insist that these secondary considerations are worth the deplorable results which flow from them. This is a candid, helpful and hopeful book. But Mr. Tomkins must find a better word than "wholeness" to express his meaning.

Nathan Söderblom: A Prophet of Christian Unity, by Dr. Peter Katz (Jas. Clarke, 4s. 6d.), is an account of a great Churchman and European who deserves to be better known in this country. He was Archbishop of Upsala, where he died in 1931. He did much to lay the foundations of the ecumenical movement. Sweden has been outside the great conflicts of this century, and its voice in world councils could never be loud; but it is easy to believe that an imaginative Christian who watched the uprising from the

abyss of the evil power that was to rend Europe would feel deeply the urgency of the unifying power of Christianity. This book would have been more useful to the general English reader if it had been a straightforward account of the life and work of Söderblom. It contains much of interest, badly arranged.

The Church in Post War Europe, by the Rev. Alexander McLeish (World Dominion Press, 1s. 6d.), is a valuable number of the post-war surveys. Ministers will be glad to have a brief, factual, well-written account of the religious situation in Europe which includes such commonly forgotten facts as that there are 9m. European Moslems. This booklet will be helpful to those who are inclined to think that the ecumenical movement is a clerics' alibi, and not much more.

Marriage Counselling, by Dr. D. R. Mace (Churchill, 8s.), is the first full account of the remedial work of the Marriage Guidance Councils in this country. It appears opportunely at a time when Government recognition and support has been given to the voluntary organization, which beginning in London is now at work in a growing number of the larger towns and cities. The need for instruction and help to people whose marriages are drifting into tragedy is well known, and where to find help and how to give it needs to be better known. Dr. Mace describes the development, largely by trial and error, of the local councils and the ways in which it is being found possible to meet many of the physical and psychological needs of people who often do not know the real sources of their troubles. The second important, but still in practice tentative, branch of marriage counselling is in advising young people. There are issues here which are not yet fully explored.

They Made Me Sign, by Fr. J. C. Heenan (Sheed & Ward, 5s.), is addressed to any non-Roman Catholic who intends to marry a practising member of that Church. The source of much trouble is not only divided loyalties within the family, but the arrogant refusal of the Roman Church to celebrate a marriage without a signed undertaking that the children shall be brought up as Roman Catholics. This book is a warning to those concerned. It is marred by ignorance of what Protestants believe and errs in supposing that all Roman Catholics accept their Church's discipline.

The Public Schools Today, by Mr. J. F. Wolfenden (Univ. of London Press, 4s. 6d.), discusses the value of the Public Schools, their place in the new planned community and the yet uncertain effects of the Fleming Report. As in all discussions of educational organization we are made to feel that the schoolmasters and the educational administrators, who have been described as "the lowest form of intellectual life", are having a private fight. The one person whose views are neither invited nor considered is the parent who directly or indirectly finds the money and indeed provides the children. This little book is a clear and sensible account of the issues involved.

J. M. Phillips.

"Theology for Modern Men" is the title of a new series of books published by James Clarke & Co. under the general editorship of Canon A. E. Baker. They are "intended for intelligent people who want to understand what Christianity is about" and "it is hoped that they will be specially useful as handbooks for adult religious education classes". If the first two volumes are a fair sample of what is to come, they should succeed. The first is *An Outline of Christian Sociology* (6s.) by the Rev. W. G. Peck. Heering said that "The effectiveness of Christianity is to be explained, very largely, by the absence of a sociology effective for our times". Mr. Peck would not claim that this book supplies the need or that it contains much that is new, but as a preliminary survey for those who are prepared to undertake serious

thought and study it is more than useful. The second volume, *Freud and Christianity* (8s. 6d.), is by the Rev. R. S. Lee, Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford, and its academic competence is indicated by the fact that it secured for him the D.Phil. degree. It is a plain account of the Freudian teaching in its bearing on the Christian faith and experience. Dr. Lee is clear that psychoanalysis has no right to pronounce upon the truth and worth of Christianity but believes that it can help to "clear away the rubbish that clings to Christianity" so that it can be free "to grow to its full stature and maturity". It is a most readable and useful book.

It may be doubted whether the small general books on pastoral psychology, which issue from the press in a steady stream, are on the whole of much value, and they are not without danger. They may, however, serve a useful purpose if they awaken ministers and others to the use which can be made of psychology by those who are prepared to equip themselves by discipline and study. Canon Lindsay Dewar's little book on *Psychology and the Parish Priest* (Mowbray, 5s.) is more likely than most to achieve this result, and it contains points which will be useful even to those who have considerable reading and experience.

L. J. Tizard.

In *Conscription Conflict* (Sheppard Press, 12s. 6d.) Mr. Denis Hayes traces the conflict of ideas on the subject of Military Conscription in Britain between 1901 and 1939. It is a fully documented book which succeeds in bringing out the main steps leading up to the introduction of Conscription in 1916 and its abolition in 1921. The period from 1921 to the reintroduction of conscription in 1939 is sketched in two brief concluding chapters. The extensive quotations from apologists of the pre-1914 era are valuable, but many of them make strange and sad reading today. The main trends of argument could have been made clearer by more judicious selection of material, but, despite occasional verboseness, the book is easy to read, and will repay careful study. The author's comment on the attitude of the Labour Party could well be pondered against the background of the modern planned state. He writes, "Insistence upon 'no conscription' could not indefinitely go hand in hand with support of war".

The Christian Origins of Social Revolt, by Mr. W. D. Morris (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.), is an attempt to describe the social teaching of the medieval 'heretical' sects, the Continental Reformers, and the English radical groups, and to show how it influenced the evolution of social life. The author leans heavily on prominent exponents of the economic interpretation of history, from whom he quotes extensively, and he seems to agree with Engels' contention that "Men, consciously or unconsciously, derive their moral ideas in the last resort from . . . the economic relations in which they carry on production and exchange". He portrays the Church as a consistent opponent of social reform, and seems to be contending for a Christian ethic divorced from the Gospel (there is a pathetic plea for the recapture of "the sense . . . of serving a great impersonal end . . ."). The book contains much that is interesting, but its conclusions are far from convincing. Is it true that "religious nonconformity exercised a baneful influence on the political education of the working class"?

The tercentenary of the execution of King Charles I has produced such a spate of adulation, that it is good to have a more balanced estimate of the man and the event. In a Historical Association pamphlet, *King Charles I, 1649-1949* (G. Philip, 1s. 6d.), Miss C. V. Wedgwood and Miss Mary Coate give brief but balanced surveys of the reasons for the execution, Prof. Mark Thomson suggests some effects of the deed in terms of constitutional practice, and Mr. David Piper writes interestingly on the value of Charles' portraits

as a key to his character ("when men think of Charles I in visual terms they think of him in terms of Van Dyck. . . . That, however, is not the whole picture").

A book on Richard Baxter can hardly fail to be of interest, but *A Pastoral Triumph*, by the Rev. C. F. Kemp (Macmillan, 11s.), offers little of value apart from its quotations from *The Reformed Pastor* and Baxter's *Autobiography*. The author gives a brief sketch of the Kidderminster ministry against a rather hazy background, and then seeks to use it as his basis for an essay on Pastoral Counselling. The book is well produced (in the U.S.A.), but is expensive even at present prices, as it has only 120 pages.

WILFRED W. BIGGS.

Miss Maisie Ward's *France Pagan?* (Sheed & Ward, 10s. 6d.) is a survey of the Mission de Paris and kindred movements which, in the Gallic tradition, is divided into three parts. The first is a sketch of the Abbé Godin, which portrays a personality, vivid and profoundly Christian, not without some idiosyncrasies. The importance of the man, his insight into the paganism he lived amongst and the inability of the Church to reach and gain the masses by its customary procedures, together with the fresh approaches he and others made to gain the people, are then revealed by Miss Ward in her valuable *résumé* of *France, Pays de Mission?* of which Godin was part author. The third part is an attempt to assess what has happened to the movements since Godin's death. The Mission de Paris and related movements are of importance far beyond the boundaries of the Roman Church, and it is to be hoped that this vital and comprehensive survey will be widely read and discussed.

It is disappointing that the Rev. Alan Walker did not begin *World Encounter* (Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.) with an assessment of the general condition, economic, political and religious, of Australia today. Having left there, he describes his brief visits to the United States, England and the Continent, and his impressions of the general condition of each country visited. His final impressions are of the Assembly of the World Council at Amsterdam, and its significance. Mr. Walker is a shrewd guide, and this account of his journeyings is informative and very interesting. He twice misspells the Rev. L. E. Cooke's name.

In *Take-Off* (Independent Press, 6s.) the Rev. Robert Duce describes, for young people in their 'teens, an air-trip in a Vickers Viking from England to Palestine and back, and points out the spiritual and moral truths that are illustrated in the experience. This method of teaching is exposed to two dangers, it may consist of mere moralizing and there may be no continuity of thought in the truths taught. There certainly is not any moralizing in Mr. Duce's teaching, to which, doubtless, many young people will give special heed because he writes with authority about planes and air travel. Many superb photographs illustrate the text. This is an uncommonly good book to put into the hands of modern youth.

And Gazelles Leaping (Michael Joseph, 12s. 6d.), by Sudhin N. Ghose, is the autobiography of an Indian boy who spent his childhood on an estate near Calcutta which retained its country nature although the surrounding district became urbanized. It is a sensitively written story which provides many insights into the Indian mind and ways of life. There are a number of choice illustrations by Arnakali E. Carlile. This finely produced book is a pleasure to read, look at and handle.

Dr. Godfrey E. Phillips' *The Religions of the World* (Religious Education Press, 6s.) is the first of a series of "Gateway Books of Religious Knowledge". Dr. Phillips begins with a brief and very helpful guide to the pronunciation of Eastern words. The first chapter disposes of some false attitudes towards

religion and the religions. There follows a succinct account of the great religions, with particular attention to those of India, because "all the great human questions are raised" by them. Dr. Phillips not only deals with the most vital subjects in each religion, but in a manner understandable and interesting to the modern mind.

Sir Angus Watson has rendered fine service in the writing of the articles (many of which have appeared in *The Christian World*) contained in *A Bow At A Venture* (Independent Press, 8s. 6d.). There is variety and topicality about them, and the subjects considered are always viewed from a Christian standpoint. There are inaccuracies in some of the quotations used.

The Rev. Arthur E. Southon has effectively related the life-story, to the present day, of Mr. Edgar Bowden, of Bristol, in *Ready for Anything* (Bath: Venturebooks, 7s. 6d.). Mr. Bowden's remarkable career contains powerful illustrations of character and ability, and his work for Christ through Methodism in Bristol shows the continuing power of the Master to reclaim and hold men. HUGH R. DOLPHIN.

A Life of De La Salle in English has been long overdue. He was one of the pioneers of modern education whose work has continued in the schools of the Christian Brothers. His dates were 1651-1719, and he was the foremost Catholic educationist of his time. He was a great believer in the vernacular and he had many other modern characteristics. In *De La Salle* (Longmans, 12s. 6d.) Dr. W. J. Battersby has written an admirable account of his work which illustrates how very much alike wise men really are, whatever their religious affiliation. A. VICTOR MURRAY.

Miss Catherine B. Firth's life of *Constance Louisa Maynard, First Mistress of Westfield* (Allen & Unwin, 18s.) gives an intimate and vivid picture of a world so remote socially from our own that it is hard to believe it is so near in time. Miss Maynard died in 1935, having kept for more than 70 years so detailed a record of her life, thoughts and feelings that one wonders how she did anything else. This mass of material her biographer has handled faithfully and skilfully. There emerges a clear picture of Miss Maynard's well-to-do mid-Victorian home, governed by heart-searching evangelical Christianity; of her eager but guarded struggles for higher education in Hitchin, Cambridge and London; and the strenuous sincerity and hard work with which she pursued her career of educating others. If it is possible to be perfectly sane without a grain of humour, sanity was one of Miss Maynard's most endearing qualities. "I will, if necessary, be a fool for Thy sake, but don't, Oh don't let me be a fool for the sake of anything else!" This is primarily, but not exclusively, a woman's book, especially attractive to those who (it may be easily and as a matter of course) have reaped the benefit of the battle for education which Miss Maynard and her colleagues waged so courageously.

Sense and Non-sense, by Dr. Cyril Alington (Blackwell, 7s. 6d.), is "a study in basic Christianity", written primarily, but not only, for teachers who have to give religious instruction, and who feel ill equipped for the task. The choice of title is an attempt to rescue the word "nonsense", using it to mean "what cannot be perceived by the senses". Sixteen short chapters and seven appendices cover general questions such as God, sin, the Church, the creeds, the Christian virtues. The Dean takes for granted too little and too much, but the book may well prove helpful and suggestive to those who have not thought at all on these subjects. K. L. CARRICK SMITH.

Perhaps the most interesting and challenging section of *Vision and Craftsmanship* by Dr. F. C. Happold (Faber, 12s. 6d.) is the last, in which the author out of a long experience of headmastering lays it down categorically that in the world of today there is far more justification than ever before for

indoctrinating boys and girls with Christian beliefs. He is well in line with progressive opinion in believing that a simple introducton to philosophy for the Sixth Form can do much good, and argues cogently for a study of the Christian mystics. W. R. NIBLETT.

"Why do you spend time reading and discussing books which tell of events which never in fact occurred?" Finding that none of his students could give a satisfactory answer to this simple question, Professor David Daiches has supplied his own in *A Study of Literature* (Cornell Univ. Press; London: Cumberlege, 15s.). This is an enquiry into the ultimate purpose and value of imaginative literature, especially the novel. If literature is worth while, Professor Daiches concludes, it must be because human experience is worth while. Free from the jargon of modern æsthetic theory, this book is intended for the "common reader", but as a sincere attempt to explain the nature of poetic truth, it would have pleased Aristotle.

The critical essays which make up *Poets and Story-Tellers* (Constable, 10s.) are written in a more conversational style than is usual with Lord David Cecil, and deal with such diverse subjects as Turgenev, *Antony and Cleopatra*, Thomas Gray and Virginia Woolf. The author's own favourite appears to be Jane Austen, whose philosophy he finds more impressive than that of Dickens or Balzac or Dostoevsky, and whom he praises with an extravagance which will appeal to other 'Janeites'. What is perhaps the best essay in the book concerns Benjamin Constant's *Adolphe*, a novel too little known in England because too austere, too French, to suit our taste.

Most readers of Mr. Hugh Kingsmill's *The Progress of a Biographer* (Methuen, 10s. 6d.) will agree with him that it is better on the whole for a biographer to be too indulgent than too severe. Mr. Kingsmill himself, however, cannot be accused of being over-indulgent; and one wishes that he had devoted his very considerable talents as a writer to telling us of his likes, which must be inferred, rather than of his dislikes, which are many and explicit. The subjects of his 37 short critical and biographical studies range from Karl Marx to P. G. Wodehouse, and from Oscar Wilde to Winston Churchill.

In *The Two Worlds of Marcel Proust* (Pennsylvania Univ. Press; London: Cumberlege, 16s.) Mr. Harold March tells the reader of *A la Recherche du Temps Perdu* much that he is likely to want to know about this great novel and its author. Most writers on Proust are violently partisan. Mr. March's tone is, throughout, judicial. The 'two worlds' are the world of time, where illusion and frustration are sovereign, and the world of eternity, where there is beauty, joy and peace, but of which we may have glimpses while still 'immersed in Time'. Mr. March shows that although Proust never quite succeeded in reconciling the two, his ultimate message is one of hope. The book contains a valuable bibliography of works on Proust.

Dr. Mark Longaker has disinterred fourteen of *The Stories of Ernest Dowson* (W. H. Allen, 7s. 6d.). This little book, which includes a critical introduction and notes, will interest students of the 1890s. Dowson was one of the few poets who cared more for his prose than his verse, but it is as a poet, and not as a story-teller, that he deserves to be remembered.

A Norfolk Diary (Harrap, 12s. 6d.) consists of passages from the diary of the Rev. Benjamin J. Armstrong, Vicar of East Dereham from 1850 to 1888. More good diaries have been written by country parsons than by men of any other calling, and this is a worthy example of the kind. Like all good diarists, Armstrong was deeply interested not only in his work and in public events, but in everything and everybody. He wrote to please himself, without thought of publication, with the result that his record is as entertaining as it is instructive. The diary has been edited, with a commendable absence of unnecessary footnotes, by the diarist's grandson, the Rev. H. B. J. Armstrong. P. A. SPALDING.

Mr. Henry Treece essays a critical appreciation of *Dylan Thomas* (Lindsay Drummond, 7s. 6d.), who startled us fifteen years ago with his first outburst of verse with its profusion of images, many of which came from the Bible (which seemed to repel him) and from sex (which seemed to attract). His inspiration and the content of his poems come from within himself. Turning away from sterile reason and the romantic heart, he has, says Mr. Treece, given a voice to the inarticulate glands and nerves. Mostly because of this limited, inner concern, his contemporary influence is small. Some of his later work suggests fuller maturity in its greater simplicity and humbler approach to faith; but he is still a 'difficult' poet.

The great promise of Alun Lewis as poet and prose-writer was cut short by his death on Active Service. A selection of letters, descriptive both of what he saw and of his own thinking and feeling, written to his parents and to his wife from India, together with half a dozen short stories have been collected under the title, *In The Green Tree* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.).

Mr. Bernard Shaw closes his collection of *Sixteen Self Sketches* (Constable, 7s. 6d.) by saying he has still enough kick left to make fresh outbursts possible. What he has written of himself here, though not all of recent date, makes this easy to believe. He tells of his boyhood and office youth, his failure as a novelist and success as critic, public speaker and dramatist; he corrects his biographers; he even flagellates his own "puritanism" with sections on sex. He states that the only interesting sort of biography is that of people who have had adventures; and he has had none. We might believe this—in spite of his power of phrase—if this were not a book by Bernard Shaw about G.B.S. And who and what is he? Does even Shaw himself know?

The illustrations to Mr. William Glynne-Jones' *The Magic Forefinger and other Welsh Fairy Stories* (Boardman, 7s. 6d.) suggest they are meant for children. They have, however, many of the elements of the authentic legendary stories beloved of ancient Celtic culture. The story of Kilhwch and Olwen especially is for adults rather than children.

Fr. John Coventry, S.J., has written a useful introduction to ethics, *Morals and Independence* (Burns, Oates, 4s. 6d.). Some of us do not wish to be reminded that "the Catholic Church asserts that she, and she alone, is the divinely appointed . . . Teacher of God's revelation"; and there are places where one disagrees with the interpretation. But it is a piece of sound work whose essential virtue lies in its being a true introduction to this kind of thought and study and not a cheap general textbook on moral philosophy.

K. W. WADSWORTH.

Dr. Eric Parsons in *The Dramatic Expression of Religion* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.) has covered a wide field in 61 pages. He writes of the origins and traces the history of Christian drama from the Mass to the Miracle and Morality plays. His longest chapter treats of the dramatic element in the Bible; but the final chapter is by far the most useful. Here he discusses the dangers and possibilities of religious drama: the place of drama in the Church and the part it can play in evangelism and education. These are things which all of us should consider. JASON S. WRIGHT.

The Castle of Perseverance, by Iwa Laungentels (S.P.C.K., 2s. 9d.), is a new and spirited adaptation of an early morality play. This piece of work will appeal to all who appreciate the beauty of symbolism; but symbolism and verse in drama demand high technique and experience, richness of settings, costumes and general production for their adequate interpretation. As a sample of its kind the play is to be commended, but its presentation should only be attempted by really skilled companies. KATHLEEN NESBITT.

SMALL BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

The Gates of Hope (Livingstone Press, 2s. 6d.) is an account of the origins and development of Jiaganj Hospital, north of Calcutta, and of day-to-day life there, by Miss Florence Gifford, who served there for 39 years, latterly as matron. Miss Gifford writes with an admirable simplicity, is always interesting, and her account is a testimony to Christian zeal and love.

Dr. Geoffrey Parrinder's *Learning to Pray* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.) is more accurately described—on the paper cover—as a manual of Christian devotional practice. It gives plain, practical guidance and should prove very helpful, particularly to people young in the Christian life; though it may tend to foster a legal-minded and "churchy" kind of Christian.

A Course in English for Local Preachers and Lay Speakers (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.), by Dr. K. Martyn Lobb, has the admirable aim of developing an appreciation of good English, and not merely of teaching correct English to lay speakers. It is to be doubted if the tone is sufficiently popular and if there are enough illustrations of correct and incorrect English for this small volume to prove very helpful to those for whom it is apparently intended. It will be useful as a textbook for a preparation class.

Teachers of senior children desirous of having a series of undated lessons will be glad to know that the *Bible Lesson Handbook, Senior Grade, Second Year* (R.E.P., 6s.), under the editorship of Miss Bertha C. Krall, has been published. These 44 lessons—competently and thoroughly done—arranged in four sections, form part of the nine years' scheme of all-Bible lessons prepared by the British Lessons Council.

Miss Gladys Taylor has re-told skilfully and in present-day English ten Old Testament stories in *Bible Stories for Children* (Warne, 7s. 6d.). The stories are clearly printed, with numerous illustrations by Paul Dessau.

Feud: A Story of South India (Livingstone Press, 2s.), by Miss Joyce Reason, is a well-told story for older children. It has a missionary setting, and shows the Christian spirit triumphing over long-standing hatreds and fears.

County Records (G. Philip, 1s. 6d.), a Historical Association pamphlet by F. G. Emmison and I. Gray, includes a most useful directory to the places where county records may be found in each county, with indications what to expect in each repository.

NEW EDITIONS

The late Dr. T. R. Glover's *The Jesus of History* (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.) makes a welcome reappearance—the twenty-fifth edition!

The English version of Père Jules Lebreton's massive and learned two-volume *The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ* has been reissued in a one-volume edition (Burns, Oates, 21s.).

The revised and enlarged fourth edition (1939) of Sir Frederic Kenyon's indispensable *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (Eyre & Spottiswoode) has again been reprinted. The price is 15s.

LECTURES, ADDRESSES, *ETC.*

The Drew Lectures delivered in 1947 by Dr. W. F. Howard have been published under the title *The Romance of New Testament Scholarship* (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.). With facile pen Dr. Howard, in sketching the lives and personalities of some famous scholars of the past, transforms what are to many only names, however illustrious, into real living people, with foibles as well as virtues.

Dr. F. D. Coggan's 1948 Tyndale Lecture, *The New Testament Basis of Moral Theology* (Tyndale Press, 1s. 6d.), is a good example of the use of scholarship to make *N.T.* words become alight with meaning for the present day. He insists that "the early Church had a very lively interest in the *ethics* of the Christian faith".

In the 1948 Joseph Smith Memorial Lecture Dr. P. W. Evans seeks to draw *Some Lessons from Marcion* (Birmingham: Overdale College, 1s. 3d.). This is a more sympathetic study of Marcion than Mr. Blackman's.

In *The Anabaptists of the 16th Century* (Carey Kingsgate Press, 1s.) the Rev. E. A. Payne asks for a fuller recognition both of the place of the "left wing of the Continental Reformation" in the Reformation itself, and of its continuing influence in the modern world.

There was appropriateness in choosing Prof. Dorothy Tarrant as the 1949 Essex Hall (Unitarian) Lecturer, for the founder of Bedford College, which has been celebrating its centenary and where Dr. Tarrant holds her Chair of Greek, was a Unitarian. The subject is *The Contribution of Plato to Free Religious Thought* (Lindsey Press, 1s.).

In the British Academy's Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture for 1947, Mr. Myles Dillon considers *The Archaism of Irish Tradition* (O.U.P., 4s.). From language, social organization and literature he presents evidence for the survival of a common Indo-European tradition in India and in Ireland.

Mr. Herbert Read's *Coleridge as Critic* (Faber, 6s.), the expanded text of a paper delivered in April 1948 at Baltimore University, is confined to Coleridge's philosophy of criticism, and ignores its application to particular poets and to the technique of poetry. In his insistence on man's power of choice, Mr. Read argues, Coleridge was approaching the Either/Or between æsthetics and ethics of Kierkegaard and the Existentialists.

In the 1948 Creighton Memorial Lecture Dr. G. N. Clark studies the tradition of *The Cycle of War and Peace in Modern History* (C.U.P., 1s. 6d.). He concludes that "The circle, with its imperceptible movements from one direction to another, is the least appropriate figure for this world of conflict and manœuvre which the experts explain to us in terms of personality and purpose".

ALSO RECEIVED

The Rev. J. E. Fison's *Notes on the Gospel according to St. Mark* (S.P.C.K., 1s. 3d.) is described as "a fresh correlation of the Gospel and the post-war world". The booklet, containing brief, incisive comments, is based on notes written by the author when an army chaplain for the use of chaplains, and is republished in a form suitable for more general use.

In *The Bible* (S.P.C.K., 1s. 3d.) the Rev. C. F. Evans has written a very good introduction for discussion groups. A special word of praise is due for the carefully compiled bibliographies.

Those who enjoyed the Rev. A. E. Southon's earlier "imaginative commentaries" *On Eagle's Wings* and *This Evil Generation*, which covered the Exodus and the sojourn in the wilderness, will be eager to read *Who is their Father?* (Cassell, 8s. 6d.), in which the story of Samuel is re-told.

Nos. 3 and 4 in the Congregational Union of Scotland's "Vital Religion Booklets" are *The Church You Can Make*, by the Rev. Harry Andrew, and *Fellowship and Freedom*, by the Rev. H. G. Newsham (6d. each).

The Conflict of Science and Religion. F. C. Bryan. Carey-Kingsgate Press, 9d.

Jamaican Journey. W. J. Brown, M.P. Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d. Mr. Brown holds one's interest whatever he is writing about. Many subjects, opinions and reflections have a place in this commentary.

Zionism in England, 1899-1949: A Jubilee Record. Paul Goodman. Zionist Federation, 5s. Originally published in 1929 and now brought up to date.

From Salvationist Supplies:

Of Such is The Kingdom. 3s. 6d. Catherine Baird. A commentary on children, how and what they should be taught, written out of a rich understanding of them.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (April). The primary article—"The Nemesis of Diversity"—is by Principal John Murray; in "Faith and Philosophy" Dr. T. F. Torrance maintains "the view that it is only by means of faith that philosophy can be kept true to itself". Mr. M. H. Carré's "A Medieval Attack on Metaphysics: Nicholas of Autrecourt" draws largely upon Prof. J. R. Weinberg's recent exposition of the surviving writings of this Ockhamist philosopher. The publication of a new English translation of Eugène Fromentin's *Dominique* provides the occasion for Mr. Charles Morgan's appreciative article, "An Old Novel Re-born". Mr. S. H. Moore writes about Christian Knorr Von Rosenroth, statesman and scholar, who is remembered chiefly today as the author of the hymn, "Jesus, Sun of Righteousness". Dr. E. L. Allen provides a competent survey of "Recent Continental Theology".

London Quarterly and Holborn Review (April). Dr. L. D. Weatherhead deals with "The Problem of Demon-Possession"; he insists that the problem is a real one, and that it is unwise to assume that demon-possessed persons were invariably epileptics. Dr. Vincent Taylor handles a massive theme—"The Creative Element in the Thought of Jesus"; he discusses such doctrines as the Messiahship, the Son of Man, the Suffering Servant, the Cross, the Resurrection, and the Parousia, and concludes that "the thought of Jesus was creative, controlling, determining". "The Two Isaacs: Newton, 1642-1727—Watts, 1674-1748", by the Rev. F. Brompton Harvey, is suggestive: "The Newtonian note sounds clearly in the large world-embracing sweep of Watts' missionary hymns".

Expository Times (February-April). Dr. J. G. McKenzie has two valuable

articles dealing with the general theme of "Freud and After"; he is aware of Freud's genius and limitations, and notes "the significance of the Spearman, Gestalt and even the Behaviourist Schools". The Rev. John Baker's subject is "The Christological Problem"; Dr. W. S. Urquhart's "The Status of the Theologian in Philosophy"; and the Bishop of Derby's "Priesthood and Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity". Prof. H. H. Rowley reviews "Recent Foreign Theology".

Evangelical Quarterly (January-April). Discussing "Luther as a Preacher", the Rev. A. Skevington Wood places first the strict *subjection* of his sermons to Scripture; he wishes that someone would do for Luther what the Rev. T. H. L. Parker's *The Oracles of God* has done for Calvin. The Rev. H. P. V. Nunn stresses "The Advantages of a Classical Training as a Preparation for the Ministry". The Rev. Nigel Turner enquires "Were the Gospels written in Greek or Aramaic?"; he thinks that Lagrange and Torrey have not fully proved their contention. Prof. Jean de Saussure writes on "Revelation and Inspiration"; Prof. L. H. Starkey on "Seeking Ethical Certainty"; and the Rev. G. T. Manley on "The Moabite Background of Deuteronomy".

International Review of Missions (April). Interesting contributions deal with "The Bible in the Church" (Rev. A. H. Wilkinson) and "The Realignment of Medical Missions: Spiritual Priorities in Changing Conditions" (Dr. Frank Lake). Two articles express an urgent contemporary concern: the Rev. Robert Brunner's " 'Modernism' and 'Irreligion' in Judaism Today: Their Significance for the Mission to the Jews" and the Rev. Robert Smith's "Communism and European Jewry". Miss Ruth Rouse writes challengingly of "William Carey's 'Pleasing Dream' "—the proposal that Andrew Fuller should convene "a meeting of all denominations of Christians at the Cape of Good Hope about 1810". The Rev. J. J. Considine provides a valuable and thought-provoking survey—"Missions of the Catholic Church, 1948".

Modern Churchman (March). In a lively contribution—"The Threat to Liberal Theology"—the Bishop of Birmingham examines the provisions of the proposed "Bishops (Retirement) Measure, 194— (No. 2)". The Rev. J. S. Bezzant, whose article on William Temple is occasioned by the publication of Dr. Iremonger's biography, challenges a widely prevalent view "that Temple in later life forsook the theological liberalism of his Oxford and Repton days for a more conservative and Anglo-Catholic position". Both Dr. T. F. Glasson ("Jesus Christ and Christian Apocalyticism") and the Rev. J. C. Hardwick ("Pascal and Ourselves") write critically, but constructively; we are left in no doubt where Modern Churchmen stand. Altogether an interesting, if rather aggressively self-conscious, number.

Modern Free Churchman (January). The Rev. F. H. Amphlett Micklewright has a spirited article on "How Church History should not be Written": "Interest lies in the revelations of the sources rather than in the moral judgments of the historian". The new Editor, the Rev. Glynmor John, is a Congregationalist; so, also, is the Rev. F. W. Tugwell, who writes on "The Doctrine of the Trinity and Modern Concepts".

Religion in Life (Spring). The Rev. C. E. Strait, who has served as a chaplain with the occupation army, writes interestingly on "Japan Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow"; he is hopeful about the Christian future in Japan, and gives high praise to General MacArthur. Dr. D. A. MacLennan, of Toronto, sees in secularism the "ancient, subtle, potent and frequently charming enemy of Christianity"; and the Rev. Norman Pittenger in "Detachment *versus* Attachment" exposes the folly of the former. Nicholas Berdyaev's last book, *The Russian Idea,* is searchingly reviewed by Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr. Useful contributions are made by Prof. S. Paul Schilling ("How Does Jesus Save?"); Prof. H. E. Richards ("Contemporary Education and Sir Richard Livingstone"); and Dr. C. Seidenspinner ("The Genius of Protestant Worship"). Prof. Chad Walsh writes on "The Pros and Cons of C. S. Lewis"—"undoubtedly the most influential lay defender of Christianity in England and America", he "has the virtues of his defects and the defects of his virtues".

World Dominion (January-February). The editorial warmly commends Dr. Albert Peel's recent book, *The Noble Army of Congregational Martyrs.* The Rev. Bernhard Citron is autobiographical in "From Synagogue to Kirk"; the Rev. O. S. Tomkins describes the growth of "The Ecumenical Movement"; and Mr. K. G. Grubb writes on "The New Look in Christian Literature". Further articles include "Should the Church Advertise?" and "Race Relations in South Africa".

Anglican Theological Review (January). The Rev. K. C. M. Sills writes on "Church Unity and the Grass Roots"; he doubts whether the laity are more in favour of unity than the clergy, and emphasizes the need for more education and instruction. The Rev. Robert Hatch is much concerned with "Ambiguities in the Marriage Canon"; Dr. G. K. Chalmers has a Graduation Address—"To Believe and Doubt Well"—which repays reading; and Dr. Walter Lowrie writes "About Christian Ethics".

Church Quarterly Review (October-December). "Christianity and the Metaphysics of Human Existence" by the Rev. J. V. Langmead Casserley is a criticism

of atheistic existentialism as exemplified particularly in Sartre and Heidegger; it may be read usefully in conjunction with the Rev. R. H. Daubney's "Human Existence and Social Reconstruction", which is a trenchant criticism of Christian existentialism. The Rev. Thomas Wood writes on "A Great English Casuist" (Robert Sanderson, sometime Bishop of Lincoln); Dr. David Daube on "Paul and Rabbinic Judaism"; and the Rev. O. T. Owen on "Science and Religion". "Some Reflections on a Theory of the Ministry" by the Rev. T. H. Balmforth amount to a review of Prof. T. W. Manson's *The Church's Ministry*. In a lengthy article, the Rev. T. Nicklin and the Rev. R. O. P. Taylor are concerned with what they consider to be Lightfoot's misunderstanding of Hegesippus.

Baptist Quarterly (January-April). A journalist, Mr. Walter Stevens, has an interesting account of "Oxford's Attitude to Dissenters, 1646-1946". The Rev. J. G. Patrick thinks that "The Realism of *The Pilgrim's Progress*" springs from Bunyan's ability to weave day-by-day incidents and experiences into his narrative. There is challenge and sanity in Dr. Percy Stocks' "World Health and Racial Equivalence". The Rev. D. S. Russell writes on "The Apocalyptic Conception of the Unity of History", and the Rev. A. S. Herbert on "The Prophet as Intercessor". Two articles of biographical interest are "Judson on Baptism" (Dr. Hugh Martin) and "John Horsch: Mennonite Historian" (Rev. E. A. Payne).

Harvard Theological Review (October). The outstanding article is by the Rev. W. L. Knox ("The 'Divine Hero' Christology in the New Testament"). Herbert J. Rose writes on "Keres and Lemures"; Frederick E. Ellis finds it "difficult to understand why the writings of Lamennais have been so singularly neglected" in the U.S.

Review of Religion (November-January). Prof. J. L. Blau evaluates "Martin Buber's Religious Philosophy"—the article is a tribute on the occasion of Buber's 70th birthday. "Man's Predicament in Eden" is treated objectively by Prof. J. B. Pritchard; Dr. Andrew Brown lengthily discusses "John Locke and the Religious *Aufklärung*". Dr. J. L. Tondriau writes academically on "Comparisons and Identifications of Rulers with Deities in the Hellenistic Period". Prof. Moses Hadas suggests that *III Maccabees* should be regarded not as history, but as *belles-lettres;* "its affinities are not with the canonical and extra-canonical historical books of the Bible but rather with the Greek romances".

Friends' Quarterly (January-April). A Dutchman, Albert J. Goodheer, writes on "Mysticism, the Way to Freedom". Frank Williams deals with "Parapsychology and Quaker Experience", and Rayne Nickalls with "Some Thoughts on Huxley's Philosophy". They are followed by John S. Hoyland with his description of the Finnish Work Camps—"New Methods of Quaker Missionary and Extension Work". Brian Sparkes ("Others Have Laboured") writes interestingly about R. C. Burn, Bevan Lean, Alfred Binyon, A. Neave Brayshaw, *etc.* There are articles on "Quaker Children in the Seventeenth Century"; "Thomas Traherne: Poet: Contemporary of George Fox"; and "Russian Mosaic". Dr. Malcolm Spencer writes informatively on "The British Council of Churches in the Christian Life of England". Reference should be made to Gerald Petrie's delightful contribution—"The Pastoral Work of Humpty Dumpty"; its meanings and warnings need not be restricted to Quakers.

Teachers of Today (December-February, March-May). An article entitled "Calling All Teachers" warmly commends the report on the Communist Challenge to Christian Youth, recently published by the Church of Scotland's Committee on the Religious Instruction of Youth. Sir Walter Moberly asks "How Far Can Education Be Christian?"; Mr. M. Domnitz writes on "Improving Human Relationships". Useful contributions come from the Rev. E. J. Morrish ("The Value of Diagrams in Religious Education"), Mr. Jack Singleton ("The Riddle of Kagawa"), and Mr. H. C. Cooksey ("The Work of Education"). The Rev. R. G. Martin pays a graceful tribute to the Editor, Mr. E. H. Hayes, for his Sunday-school work; he has published the *Concise Guides* for over thirty years.

Yale Review (Winter-Spring). The Colonial Secretary, Mr. A. Creech Jones, on "The British Colonial Territories: Current Scene and Outlook for the Future", is lucid and informative: he clears away some misconceptions and offers some constructive explanations. A strong team of writers including Mr. John Chamberlain, Prof. W. G. Carleton and Mr. E. K. Lindley deals with the American political scene. Wider issues are by no means overlooked: Prof. R. Strausz-Hupé writes on "France and the Future German State"; Mr. David Bernstein on "Lesson from Luzon"; and Mr. R. L. Marks on "A View of Argentina under Peron". Prof. H. M. Martin presents vividly "The Challenge of Heart Disease"—a very serious public health problem. Literary articles include "T. S. Eliot" by Prof. David Daiches; "A New Letter from Fielding" by Prof. E. L. McAdam, Jr.; and "Boy-Men and Man-Boys" by Mr. Asher Brynes.

H. Cunliffe Jones.